GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY : Case No. - MOUNT VERNON CAMPUS : 09-19

Special Exemption Approval : and Further Processing of a : Campus Plan and Related : Relief :

:

Thursday, March 25, 2010

The Public Hearing of Case No. 09-19 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson KONRAD SCHLATER, Commissioner MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC) PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER PAUL GOLDSTEIN

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on March 25, 2010.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<pre>INTRODUCTION: Anthony J. Hood</pre>
APPLICANT'S TESTIMONY: David Avitabile
REPORT OF OFFICE OF PLANNING: Paul Goldstein
REPORT OF ANC 3-D Ann Heuer
ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS IN SUPPORT: Alma Gates
ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS IN OPPOSITION: Foxhall and W Street Coalition, Charles Pashiain
APPLICANT'S CLOSING: David Avitabile
MEETING ADJOURNED: Anthony J. Hood

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

HOOD:

CHAIRMAN

and gentlemen.

2

1

6:35 p.m.

evening,

public

Good

is

а

3

4

ladies

2010.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the Zoning Commission hearing of for District of Columbia for Thursday, March 25,

This

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining evening are Commissioners me this May, Schlater and Turnbull. We're also joined by Office Zoning staff, the of Ms. Sharon Schellin, Office of the Attorney General, Ms. Nagelhout, Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser and Mr. Goldstein.

This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter. It is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noise or actions in the hearing room.

subject of this evening's The hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 09-19. This is request by George Washington а

University for Special Exception Relief pursuant to 210 and 3104.1 of the zoning regulations in regards to the Mount Vernon Campus Plan.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the *D.C. Register* on December 25, 2009. And copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR 3117 as preliminary matters, Applicant's follows: case, report of the Office of Planning, report of other government agencies, report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition, rebuttal and closing by the Applicant.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this meeting: the Applicant, 60 minutes; organizations, five minutes; individuals, three minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The Commission intends to adhere to the time limit as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limit for presentations if necessary and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to the Commission to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	this case must be based exclusively on the
2	public record. And to avoid any appearance to
3	the contrary, the Commission requests that
4	persons present not engage the Members of the
5	Commission in conversation during any recess
6	or at any time. The staff will be available
7	throughout the hearing to discuss procedural
8	questions.
9	Please turn off all beepers and
10	cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt
11	these proceedings.
12	Would all individuals wishing to
13	testify please rise to take the oath?
14	Ms. Schellin, would you please
15	administer the oath?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
17	(Whereupon, all the witnesses were
18	sworn.)
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would just like
20	to remind everyone that we have an interpreter
21	so we want to make sure we speak slowly and
22	carefully so we don't do like I did at a

1 previous hearing. 2 3 4 Does preliminary matters? 5 6 MS. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters.

the staff have any

SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We do have a party status request. Of course, this is in addition to the proffered experts which the Applicant will address when they come to the table.

party status But we have And then this evening -- or this afternoon rather -- we received a letter from an individual -- I'm trying to put my hand on it -- Charles Boucher, and I'm not sure I'm saying his name correctly. It's at Exhibit 16.

My understanding is they were part of the original group that asked for party status, and they're asking to be pulled out of that group and be considered as a separate party status.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Schellin.

Do we have the Neighborhood Alliance representative here tonight?

Originally the status application says they were in opposition.

Do we have anyone here, or at least the person who's supposed to represent the Neighborhood Alliance?

(No audible response.)

Would suggest, colleagues, and we have both of their submittals -- Exhibit 6 -- and also Exhibit 16. Mr. Pashaian, Jr. is the lawyer at the top of Exhibit 16. We have the formal request in our possession. Then we have the request which states -- no, actually it's 14. We have the request that states, if granted by the Commission from the Alliance -- what they say here, "If granted by the Commission, the Neighborhood Alliance wishes to retain party status, but will only take a position in

NEAL R. GROSS

the proceeding in the event that the substantive modification or amendments for George Washington University's pre-hearing filing which materially affected Neighborhood Alliance."

Really, this goes with moving on an assumption because I look at this, they now have withdrawn their opposition. They will not be called for party status if we granted what they asked for. And they will be a party in support -- reading through the lines, a party in support. But they asked to be given party status.

And there's nothing in writing if no one is here other than the person who they identified previously to represent them. So I would -- or I would recommend to my colleagues if you all so wish that we would grant the Neighborhood Alliance party status along with support of party status, but will not be called through these proceedings for any questioning or cross-examination.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman,
2	I'm confused. But there's nobody here from
3	the Neighborhood Alliance, right?
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Nobody
5	here. But I'm trying to read through their
6	request and you know what happens when you
7	assume. But I'm just looking at their
8	request.
9	What they gave us the formal
10	part of status application says opposition.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: There seems to
12	be someone in the crowd. Are you affiliated
13	with the Neighborhood Alliance?
14	You need to be on the microphone.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's the only
16	other issue. For party status, you have to
17	identify who's and I don't want to get into
18	any objections. So that's why I'm trying to
19	handle it this way.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because what will
22	happen is if he was not the person certified

Τ	to speak, then he can't speak for the
2	Neighborhood Alliance.
3	Were you certified to speak? And
4	I'll just look at your head and you can shake
5	it.
6	Were you the one certified to
7	speak on behalf of the Neighborhood Alliance?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: No. Chairman, he's
9	actually the other requesting party. So
LO	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We are coming to
11	that. We'll get to that.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: He's maybe
13	confused. He hasn't gotten to you yet.
L4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, that's second.
15	We're going to get there.
L 6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
L7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I just
18	don't understand the purpose of having party
L9	status for a party that isn't going to be
20	present to participate as a party.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May, I was
22	just trying to honor a request in Exhibit 14.

1	But if you all are so inclined not to do so,
2	I could go ahead and what?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I don't
4	object to they're being a party either if we
5	think that there's some chance that they might
6	show up and tend to participate. But you're
7	right. They have to be a party in support or
8	a party in opposition.
9	I mean, if the rest of the
10	Commission would like to just give them the
11	party status and then we'll see what happens,
12	I think that's fine.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll wait to hear
14	from the other guys. I could go either way.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Well, my
16	sense is if they do show up, we'd like to
17	afford them the opportunity for party status.
18	If they don't show up, then they don't show
19	up and they don't participate and there's no
20	harm done.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: That's fine.
22	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I'd be

1	okay with granting party status.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right.
3	That's fine.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
5	I concur with Mr. Schlater. I think that
6	would be fine.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So what I
8	was saying earlier on, I want to make sure
9	this is not a problem because if they do show
LO	up, I was saying that because we have nothing
11	in writing, well, if the person who's not
12	authorized to cross-examine, and plus once we
13	start a case if they come 15 minutes well,
L 4	actually they may be here before we get
15	started if they come 15 or so minutes late,
L 6	then I don't know what they're going to cross-
L7	examine because they're going to miss most of
18	the case.
L9	My statement was that they would
20	not be authorized or be able to cross-examine.
21	But you know what? We'll cross that bridge
22	When we get there I'll withdraw that

1	statement.
2	We will grant them party status I
3	believe as a proponent. And I would move that
4	we grant them party status as a proponent, and
5	so note that no one is here at the time of the
6	granting of the party status, and ask for a
7	second.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
10	seconded.
11	Any further discussion?
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All those in
14	favor?
15	(A CHORUS OF AYES.)
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
17	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
18	vote?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
20	the vote four to zero to one to grant party
21	status in support to the GW Mount Vernon
22	Campus Neighborhood Alliance Group. And

1	again, this is to grant party status in
2	support.
3	Commissioner Hood moving;
4	Commissioner Schlater seconding; Commissioners
5	May and Turnbull in support; Commissioner
6	Keating not present, not voting.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And forgive me, I
8	was supposed to ask Mr. Avitabile.
9	Did you have any opposition? I
10	know it's late. But if you want to record the
11	opposition to doing that.
12	MR. AVITABILE: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
14	Okay. Next we have a request
15	and I think this is Exhibit 16. Am I correct,
16	Ms. Schellin? Thank you. That's all right.
17	Let me get the right exhibit in
18	front of me.
19	Okay, Commissioners, we have a
20	request from Mr. Pashaian. I hope I'm
21	pronouncing that right.
22	If you come to the table, you can

1	correct me because I don't want to butcher
2	your name or mess it up.
3	I'd like for you to repeat exactly
4	what you said on the mic so everybody knows I
5	didn't do a bad job.
6	MR. PASHAIAN: I represent
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just give me your
8	name first.
9	MR. PASHAIAN: Charles Pashaian.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Pashaian.
11	MR. PASHAIAN: I represent the
12	majority owner of the house at the corner of W
13	Street.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me cut you
15	right off.
16	I understand that. I just really
17	wanted the pronunciation of your name.
18	We have the submittal here. We're
19	going to deal with that now. You have not
20	been given party status, and you have not been
21	turned down. So let's us deal with it first.
22	MR. PASHAIAN: Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And if you're
2	turned down, then we need to hear from you.
3	But if you're not turned down, we don't need
4	to hear from you. Okay?
5	MR. PASHAIAN: So if I sit here,
6	what do you want me to do?
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I really wanted
8	you to come so I could pronounce your last
9	name correctly.
10	MR. PASHAIAN: Oh, okay.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And what's your
12	last name again?
13	MR. PASHAIAN: Pashaian. Long a.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Pashaian.
15	Pashaian.
16	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. Pashaian.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Colleagues,
18	we have a submittal from Mr. Pashaian
19	Exhibit #16. At one time obviously, but we
20	can see how the person he's represented was a
21	member of the Neighborhood Alliance.
22	Obviously if you look at Exhibit

16, we see where -- it says, "However, should we be entitled to full representation as a party to this matter which you can see has not been accorded the right by an entity that was supposed to represent, however, through no fault of the homeowner" -- I think that the court allows for us to be able to -- anyone who is within sight I believe of any project, and I think there's case law that says that they have a right to be given party status.

But I'm going to open it up to my colleagues. We see the request in Exhibit 16.

I am in favor actually of giving them party status. And I will open it up.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would concur with you on this. And I think it's primarily from page four of Exhibit 16, which is email that the was attached apparently from Mr. Gardner to sent Pashaian, and basically saying that based upon primary association, their on the Alliance's concerns for W Street, that's all

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	they really pursued with the University, and
2	that they really didn't get into any of the
3	issues on Foxhall. It sounded like there were
4	concessions that they couldn't give up.
5	So in that case, I believe that
6	Mr. Pashaian entered this case for Sheila
7	Griffin. I think they do make a case to get
8	party status because they're right across the
9	street.
10	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Is 2200
11	Foxhall Road right across the street?
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I do
13	believe. Yes. If you look
14	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.
15	Pashaian?
16	MR. PASHAIAN: Is that a question?
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure.
18	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes, it is directly
19	across the street from the University on W.
20	The entrance is on W. People come and go from
21	W. The windows look out from W onto the

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's across
2	from where W hits Foxhall?
3	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. It's the
4	brick house right on the corner.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And one of
6	your primary concerns is the Building A1?
7	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. That is the
8	primary concern.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
11	comments?
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No objection. Mr.
14	Avitabile, do you have any objection?
15	MR. AVITABILE: For the record, we
16	would just like to state our objection just
17	based on the fact that we just found out about
18	this today. There was no indication he
19	hasn't demonstrated meeting the criteria of a
20	
	party status formally through the process.
21	And we don't have any evidence of having shown

1	But again, we're just stating the
2	opposition for the record.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
4	very much for your objection.
5	I think what we're going to do is
6	that we're going to grant party status. I
7	think that he has shown good cause.
8	I can kind of see how this kind of
9	worked out, and not knowing that one group is
LO	still on one street what's the W Street
11	as opposed to Foxhall. And I think the issues
12	particularly dealing with A1 Building A1
13	are of concern. I think by statute and by
L 4	previous case law that they be afforded the
15	opportunity of party status because they're
16	directly effected and it's within their view.
L7	So with that, I would move that we
18	give them Mr. Pashaian, are you going to be
L9	you're going to be the representative?
20	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Okay. I
22	would agree that we give Mr. Pashaian client

1	party status. I think it's Ms. Green. Is it
2	Ms. Green.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Griffin.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Griffin. Yes.
5	Ms. Griffin party status. And we will come up
6	with a name. Ms. Griffin, the homeowner
7	MR. PASHAIAN: She's one of the
8	home she's the primary homeowner.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: She's the primary
10	homeowner. Okay.
11	Well, anyway, we'll come up
12	MR. PASHAIAN: She owns most of
13	it.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We normally have a
15	name. But since it's her, we'll just come up
16	with
17	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Can I ask
18	a question?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure. You have
20	one question.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Does she
22	live there?

1	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyway, Mr.
3	Pashaian, we will grant your client party
4	status.
5	And I would so move and ask for a
6	second.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
9	seconded.
10	This is an opposition, right?
11	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Party status in
13	opposition.
14	It has been moved and properly
15	seconded.
16	Any further discussion?
17	(No audible response.)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you ready for
19	the question?
20	All those in favor?
21	(A CHORUS OF AYES.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hearing no

1	opposition, so ordered.
2	Staff, would you record the vote?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
4	the vote four to zero to one to grant party
5	status in opposition to Sheila Griffin.
6	Commissioner Hood moving;
7	Commissioner Turnbull seconding; Commissioners
8	May and Schlater in support; Commissioner
9	Keating not present, not voting.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And also, Ms.
11	Schellin, with that motion, it was also
12	agreeable by consensus that we waive our rules
13	that Mr. Avitabile mentioned earlier.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Correct.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do
16	we have anything else any other preliminary
17	matters?
18	MR. PASHAIAN: I thank the
19	Chairman and the Commission.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
21	Okay. Do we have anything else?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Just the expert

1	witnesses, which I believe Mr. Avitabile will
2	probably go into.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's go down your
4	list of experts.
5	MR. AVITABILE: Sure. As we
6	stated in our pre-hearing submission which the
7	Commission I'm sure received, we have a number
8	of expert witnesses tonight including Matt
9	Bell in the field of architecture, Marsha Lea
10	in the field of landscape architecture, Kyle
11	Oliver in the field of civil engineering, Jami
12	Milanovich in the field of traffic
13	engineering, and Carl Elefonte in the field of
14	architecture.
15	They've all appeared before the
16	Commission in the past and have been certified
17	as experts. Their rèsumès are before you, and
18	we ask that they be recognized as experts.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sure my
20	colleagues got that, Mr. Avitabile. So
21	forgive me, I was off to the side. So what I
22	will do is turn to them.

1	Do we have any objections?
2	(No audible response.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No objections. So
4	all of them? We're fine with all of them?
5	(No audible response.)
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're good.
7	Thank you.
8	MR. AVITABILE: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I guess with that,
LO	we can get started.
11	While we're setting up, we have
12	ANC 3-D. And there's another name Ms. Ann
L3	Heuer. Okay. Ms. Heuer's a party, and also
L 4	the Griffin party in opposition. Okay.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: And Chairman Hood,
L 6	since we have the interpreter here, we will
L7	not be turning off the lights this evening for
L8	the PowerPoint presentation. I just want to
L9	let everybody know that.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And if
21	we're not speaking properly or too fast like I
22	was doing previously, please let us know.

MR. AVITABILE: All right. Thank you. Everyone's ready.

Good evening, Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission. My name is David Avitabile with the law firm of Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman. I am here tonight with Maureen Dwyer on behalf of the Washington University to present their tenyear campus plan for the Mount Vernon campus.

As the Commission is aware, under Section 210 of the zoning regulations, universities permitted in residentialare zoned districts special as а exception provided that the university demonstrates it is "not likely to become objectionable to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students or other objectionable conditions." As we will demonstrate this evening, the 2010 Mount Vernon Campus Plan meets this test.

I want to briefly orient everyone to the Mount Vernon campus. It's located in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia in the Foxhall neighborhood of Ward 3. The campus is bordered by Whitehaven Parkway to the south, Foxhall Road to the east, W Street to the North, and the Berkeley Terrace residential community to the west.

The main entrance to the campus is located off of Whitehaven Parkway. There is also a secondary access road from Whitehaven that was recently added by the University. And finally, there is also an entrance and a surfaced parking lot located off of W Street which you will hear more about this evening.

For well over а year, GW has worked to develop a campus plan for the 23acre Mount Vernon campus that not only meets requirements of the the strict zoning also includes regulations but meaningful improvements that address longstanding community concerns. Key to this process has been meaningful outreach and dialogue with all stakeholders.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

At the outset, GW held a series of
eight community meetings starting in April
2009 which provided nearby neighbors with ar
opportunity to not just passively listen to a
presentation, but to literally sit at the
table and actively participate. These
meetings included robust discussions on key
issues of importance such as enrollment, storm
water management, noise, lighting, as well as
building design and massing. The meetings
provided all parties an opportunity to find
common ground. And this was reflected in the
campus plan that was filed with the Commission
last November.

Since filing, GW has continued to reach out to meet its neighbors' concerns. As we detailed in our pre-hearing submission, the University made additional changes that responded to the remaining concerns of the Neighborhood Alliance. GW also appeared before ANC 3-D over the past three months to present the plan and address their concerns,

NEAL R. GROSS

and as you can see has secured their approval as well.

campus plan before you this The evening was developed with the forthcoming rewrite of the zoning regulations in mind. provides detailed roadmap for the а development of the campus over the next decade that anticipates some of the future regulatory includes details changes. The plan building location, massing and height, as well as design quidelines intended to provide a clearer understanding of what the form and shape of new construction will be. The plan also includes specific details on the timing and implementation of proposed improvements.

As reflected in their reports, we secured the support of multiple city including OP and DDOT. agencies We have modified our documents to include OP's recommended conditions and language, and we have submitted those revised conditions of approval, implementation schedule and design

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

guidelines to you this evening. I believe Ms. Schellin has distributed them.

And at the close of our presentation, I'll address the outstanding issues raised in the ANC's and DDOT's reports.

We're also here tonight for further processing approval of the first piece of the 2010 plan -- the renovation of and addition to Ames Hall. In connection with Ames Hall, we have requested special exception approval for the proposed roof structure design which does not strictly meet the onesetback requirement. The to-one architect has continued to work with staff of the Historic Preservation Office since the filing of a pre-hearing submission to refine the roof structure design. And the results of these efforts is a better design that meets the requirements of relief from Section 411.

To that end, we've also submitted a revised roof plan and accompanying elevations that show this revised roof

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	structure design. And I believe Ms. Schellin
2	has also distributed those to you. And our
3	project architect will discuss those in detail
4	later in the presentation.
5	And with that, I will turn it over
6	to Alicia O'Neil.
7	MS. O'NEIL: Hi. Good evening,
8	Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission.
9	My name is Alicia O'Neil. I'm the Senior
10	Associate Vice President for Operations at GW.
11	And on behalf of the University, I thank you
12	for your time and consideration of our campus
13	plan this evening.
14	As a matter of background and
15	context for those that are not familiar with
16	the campus, in the late 1990s, GW acquired
17	Mount Vernon College, formerly the Mount
18	Vernon Seminary, and has been operating that
19	campus under our campus plan since 1999.
20	GW, whose primary location is in
21	Foggy Bottom and which is covered by a
22	separate campus plan, is proud to have

established this 23-acre campus into a coeducational academic village with a unique
character and full-scale amenities combining
the resources of our international research
university with the benefits of a smaller,
more intimate campus that is easily accessible
and closely linked to downtown Washington.

The Mount Vernon campus offers a wide variety of academic and student life opportunities including campus recreation. Additionally, the campus is to home undergraduate student residents, freshmen and sophomores. The campus specialty curricular programs provides living and learning communities such as the GW Women's Leadership Program, a legacy to Mount Vernon's history in women's education. The campus also hosts graduate courses, largely in forensic science and interior design.

In advance of tonight's hearing, the University engaged in a substantial planning process working with members of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	community as well as District agencies to
2	envision the future of this campus.
3	Specifically, the University hosted eight
4	formal community meetings in 2009, met with
5	individual members of the community to discuss
6	key issues including enrollment and counting
7	methodologies, presented at four meetings of
8	ANC 3-D to share information about the plan,
9	met with St. Patrick's School regarding the
10	future of the campus, and we kept detailed
11	records in the form of an issues exhibit to
12	document community concerns and the
13	University's responses to those issues.
14	Additionally, we have met with the Office of
15	Planning, the Office of Historic Preservation,
16	DDOT, the Department of the Environment, and
17	Fire and Emergency Management. Further, the
18	University has engaged consultants to provide
19	work product to enhance the plan and respond

In addition to the campus planning expertise that we have here with us tonight,

NEAL R. GROSS

to community concerns.

20

21

the University took additional steps to ensure
a full evaluation of the campus to meet all
means. This included updating our campus
survey, engaged EEK Architects to do a
complete audit of existing campus buildings
and their square footages, conducting
acoustical investigations at the soccer field
and along Foxhall Road, engaging lighting
experts to discuss options for mitigating the
tennis court lights, conducting a test of the
soil at the location of the W Street parking
lot, and engaging consultants to review the
potential for both archaeological and historic
resources on the campus.

At the start of the planning process, the University set out to understand key concerns of the community and reconcile those with the goals of the University to establish a plan that met all objectives. We outlined our goals at the beginning of the planing process as follows.

First, to develop a plan that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

meets our forecasted space needs for
additional academic programs and student
residences on the campus and continue to
balance the living and learning community,
these needs were anticipated: future growth
on the campus of 100,000 net square feet of
academic space and approximately 100 net new
residential beds; enhancement to the physical
environment of the campus including the campus
perimeter, the provision of sidewalks and
campus lighting; to demonstrate a commitment
to sustainability through building design,
storm water management, landscaping and other
efforts. We also sought to bring transparency
to the key measures in the campus plan
including the re-verification of campus GFA
that I spoke about a moment ago, and also
ensuring clarity in our enrollment methodology
and how we count our students at the Mount

Finally, GW sought for the campus plan to be a platform for us to continue a

NEAL R. GROSS

Vernon campus.

1	positive relationship with our neighbors and
2	ensure that we met all of the commitments that
3	we have made that would carry forward into
4	this campus plan.
5	This process I've just described
6	has led to the plan that's before you today.

And I'll summarize the key features briefly.

With respect to campus development, we have proposed the same amount of new construction as was approved in the existing 2000 campus plan. We focussed on achieving a balance of uses on the campus. We've developed site-specific guidelines for development including the height, bulk location of new development on the campus. This development has been located toward the center of the campus, away from residential neighborhoods. And we've provided design guidelines for future campus buildings.

With respect to transportation and circulation, we've agreed to close the ${\tt W}$ Street entrance to the campus and remove the ${\tt W}$

NEAL R. GROSS

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Street parking lot. We've also agreed to continue the Vern Express Shuttle to transport students, faculty and staff between our Mount Vernon and Foggy Bottom campuses.

With respect to campus perimeter improvements, the plan calls for a commitment to perimeter landscaping on all of the campus frontages, fencing improvements along Foxhall Road, new sidewalks, signage and campus entrance improvement along Whitehaven, and again closure of that W Street entrance to the north of the campus.

With respect to sustainability and environmental, this for plan calls а commitment to a minimum of the equivalent of LEED certification for all new construction, a comprehensive storm water management system that will be implemented as new construction is implemented on the campus, no lighting on field the soccer and enhanced lighting controls on the tennis courts, and mitigation of noise from both the soccer field and some

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mechanical units along Foxhall Road.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

With respect to campus population, the University is requesting an increase in the number of students on a daily basis to 1,725 on a headcount basis and 1,100 on a full-time equivalent basis. This is a modest increase based on an increase in enrollment associated with the new academic programs and residential spaces proposed for the campus.

Under the 2000 campus plan, GW had a cap on a daily basis of 1500 on headcount basis and 1,000 on a full-time equivalent basis.

The 2000 plan also gave GW right to come back and request an increase to student enrollment caps after these years, which GW did not do. We're here at time requesting this increase. We believe it's a modest increase and will not have objectionable impacts the on neighborhood. We also continue to expect not more than 150 faculty and staff on the campus on a daily basis.

In addition to these limitations student enrollment, GW has proposed a number of conditions to mitigate any potential objectionable impacts on the neighborhood, including limitations on the location, use, height, density and lot coverage of proposed campus developments, define vehicular circulation and parking restrictions, limitations to mitigate potential noise and lighting impacts, and continued quarterly meetings to ensure that we continue a dialogue with our neighbors about issues of concern.

And in order to create certainty for members of the community that the benefits that GW has agreed to during the planning process will come to fruition, we've also agreed to an implementation schedule for these improvements. Noise improvement measures are already underway both at the soccer field and along Foxhall Road; we've agreed to install automatic timers on the tennis court lights starting in November of 2010; perimeter fence

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	improvements along Foxhall would be underway
2	within six months of approval of this plan;
3	closure of the W Street entrance and removal
4	of that parking lot after completion of Ames
5	Hall or if another project were to be
6	developed in advance of Ames Hall at the
7	completion of that project; sidewalk and other
8	Whitehaven entrance improvements would be
9	underway within a year of approval.
10	We're proud to be here tonight
11	proposing a campus plan that we believe meets
12	the needs of the University in achieving our

the needs of the University in achieving our educational mission while addressing issues that have been raised by the community and garnering support from our neighbors.

In order to address the planning process and the proposed campus development, Matt Bell from EEK Architects.

MR. BELL: Good evening. I'm Matt Bell, principle at Ehrenkrantz Eckstut & Kuhn Architects here in Washington.

And what I'd like to do is talk a

NEAL R. GROSS

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

little bit about the plan in context of the existing plan -- some of the issues with that -- also review some of the issues that we heard from the community during our community process, and then talk a little bit about the 2010 plan and what are the features of this plan, how it works and what are the important aspects that we believe bring to you tonight a very much improved plan both in terms of its concept of how it is organized and in terms of its detail.

This is the existing 2000 campus plan here. And some of the features of this that it included 180,000 gross square feet of development, about half of that in academic space. And at the time, these two projects have been completed, and Pelham Hall will completed here be shortly. Ιt concentrated about 80,000 square feet of W Street development on the corner Foxhall Road, fundamentally putting a great deal of the development at the perimeter of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the campus, and also eliminating a number of the smaller residential buildings that were characteristically in scale with this side of the campus and W Street here on the northern edge of the campus.

When we started the process, believed that this plan could be significantly improved upon. Some of the things we heard from the residents when we began the discussions at the beginning of the process that they concerned about the were were buildings at this corner. They felt that the buildings introduced here was too much development in this corner and also eliminated buildings that people felt were in character and in scale with the residential character of We heard that they wanted the W Street. architectural character of that area and also of the campus of the older buildings to be maintained and enhanced.

There was concern as Alicia mentioned about noise from the soccer field,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	F
2	t
3	
4	ē
5	₩
6	
7	5
8	k
9	r
10	k
11	C
12	5
13	
14	
15	5
16	
17	t

18

19

20

21

22

particularly at this end here. And Alicia's talked about the University commitments there. Noise emanating from mechanical equipment along Foxhall Road, there was a concern as well.

Some neighbors also noted that some of the buildings they felt turned their backs to the neighborhood and were not good neighbors. They were facing into the campus but not providing the appropriate level of detail on the architecture relative to the sides that faced the community.

And finally, one of the big concerns that was expressed to us was the W Street entry. People felt that this was not only not particularly pretty to look at but there was a concern about traffic coming in and out of here on what is fundamentally a residential street.

Let's go to the next slide.

What we're looking at here, this is a snapshot of the existing uses on the

campus today. This is Pelham Hall, currently under construction. You can see residential buildings in red -- residential life buildings in red -- and academic buildings in green. And of course, this campus tries to balance academic and residential uses. It's not simply one use or the other. The University's intention is to make a balanced campus there where students can live and attend class and live a full collegiate lifestyle.

other that the One concern neighborhood had expressed the was concentration of residential buildings along that edge in the 2000 plan. They felt that it would be a better plan if it balanced academic uses on the edge which tend to have a more quiet appearance at night than residential uses as well. So we took these concerns into consideration in moving forward with the plan we're bringing forward to you tonight.

This is the plan -- one of the documents in the plan. And I just want to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

review some of the most important aspects of this. This includes a net new of 150,000 gross square feet and net new of about 100 beds on the campus.

The red line here is the existing property line, and the blue line is the setback line. And this line is the setback line that was established with the 2000 plan and has not been altered.

Our plan that we're bringing tonight does not ask for any kind of changes with respect to those issues. It does a number of significant things.

Number is it one concentrates density more towards the center of the campus and away from the edges of the campus. Ιt eliminates the vehicular entry at W Street right here. And we'll have some detail about that from Marsha Lea of EDAW to follow. keeps all but one of the existing buildings along the W Street side. Here are these buildings that have a particular character of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sloped roofs and brick appearances and very nice general details. It retained, as I mentioned, the setbacks from the 2000 plan. And it balanced -- and I'll show a diagram in a second that shows the intended uses -- but it balances academic uses along W Street with residential properties along the center of the campus. In other words, the idea being not to concentrate the residential in one area but to really sort of work it together so all of these things form the campus together.

Go to the next slide, please.

This talks a little bit about what some of those uses will be. So what you see here is the introduction of academic buildings at A1 and A2 along that edge, and then a residential building brought into the center of campus at R-1 and continuing with either the planned expansion at Ames here -- A4 -- or replacement of an existing building at A3. So the green will be academic buildings and red will be residence buildings.

NEAL R. GROSS

I want to call your attention as well to the chart over here on the left side of this slide. As David mentioned, we had a very robust community process. A lot of very good ideas emanated from the community, and I believe there was a very healthy dialogue.

What happened over time is we of course started in one place and ended up where we are

tonight, which we believe is a strong plan.

I just want to call your attention to the numbers here. In the summer of 2009, these were the development square footages for the various sites. So for example, A1 was shown as 45,000 square feet, A2 25 and so on and so forth. If you look at the current plan, which we revised in October, you can see in general A1, which is here, was reduced in size from its initial study. A2 was reduced in size from its initial study. And the buildings in the center of the campus, you can see the different adjustments that were made here to end up with this net new GFA of about

NEAL R. GROSS

150,000 square feet.

To give you a little bit of detail on that, in particular we developed this slide to show what the relationship is of the buildings we're planning in the future to what's there and the heights of some of the context around.

So for example, this building here -- Al -- we're showing the height at 320. Now what that means is that the maximum height of anything to do with that building would be 320.

One of the crucial things to understand about this site is it has a lot of topography that slopes. So we felt the best way to deal with understanding height and establishing guidelines for that was to note where the maximum height of the building could be.

So for example, in A1, it's three feet shorter than the Eckels Library which is just to the south of it. In A2, the building

is 39 feet tall, and it's about eight feet shorter than Meriwether Hall which is just to the east of it. And this is where the former vehicular entry is, and we're replacing that with a path.

In A3, for example, this building would be 39 feet, and it's a couple of feet shorter than the existing Ames. And R1 here, this building would show its roof elevation at 295.

What we're also showing in this drawing is what the approximate footprint would be based upon the square footage we have in the plan which is in the yellowish color. And we're showing an area where the building footprint could be.

Now obviously, we haven't designed each of these buildings. But what we're trying to show is the approximate location where that building could be built relative to its neighbors. So in some cases, we've indicated both where the height is and in all

cases we're indicated where we're taking the height from, and we're showing things like some of the distances between the buildings and how they relate to one another -- trying to provide a level of detail.

David reminds me of a very important thing. The number listed on here -the maximum height -- includes the penthouse.
That would be to the top of the building. So the penthouse would be underneath that. We were trying to sort of find a way to make sure we understood how we could account for all aspects of height that could occur on the campus.

So, the other thing that the community expressed to us that I think the University has an interest in as well is making sure that the buildings are compatible, both with the architectures on the campus and the many aspects of the very nice residential neighborhood that is nearby. So for example, some of the things we have in the design

NEAL R. GROSS

guidelines are predominantly brick and precast with pre-cast details. People expressed a strong concern not to have large walls of glass or big metal buildings. And I think that's a wise decision.

Also developing street facades consistent with the same level of detail that you find on the campus interior that you find on the exterior, and also making sure that those facades are working well in the various frontages around the campus.

I mentioned, the roofs big concern on the campus. Many of the older buildings have pitched roofs of different The idea here is to list the kinds of roofs that will occur as buildings are built. interesting discussion. There was а very People felt that buildings with predominantly flat roofs were not valued very highly. So we said okay, well, maybe some secondary areas might be flat but the predominant sort of rendition of the building would have a pitched

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

roof.

And then the mechanical penthouse for A1 will be set back here with some very specific language about how that's going to be treated, as well as the top story mechanical penthouse for A2 on the corner of Foxhall and W set back 20 feet from the north to minimize the impact on that corner and make a better massing there.

Then there's some other language here about development constraints relative to the mechanical penthouses. We've spent a lot of time talking about that, and we think we have something here that is very workable both for the University and gives a high degree of predictability for the community about what is likely to becoming in subsequent buildings.

Next one, please. Thank you.

As part of the plan, we looked carefully at vehicular circulation. And you'll hear a little bit more about that. But one of the primary things of course is

orienting the campus towards the Whitehaven
Parkway entrance here.
So what this diagram is showing is
the two-way traffic in the loop around the
shuttle parking and loop out the sort of
controlled access over to Pelham, the
preponderance of structured parking here,
small amounts of surface parking, and then
we're indicating where the primary service
entries would be so that it's clear as these
buildings are developed that's where these
likely and necessary places will occur.

At this point, it's good to turn it over now to Marsha Lea of EDAW to talk more about how the campus is organized and how the plan takes ideas related to the new entrance along Whitehaven and the perimeter treatments and the lab rates. So I'll hand the laser pointer to Marsha.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your microphone on, please.

> Good evening. MS. LEA:

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

is Marsha Lea. I'm a landscape architect and principle with EDAW, Inc.

As Matt said, the parking lot on W Street will be eliminated. And in its place we're proposing a pedestrian connection from the existing sidewalk along W Street into campus. That same connection would also function as an emergency vehicle route using a reinforced turf for the width that is required for the fire lane and also your detail of that in a few moments.

other sidewalk improvements include adding a sidewalk on the campus side of Whitehaven Parkway from the corner of Foxhall over to the main entrance into campus. There is an existing sidewalk on the east side of Foxhall that runs north and south and also on the west side of Foxhall south of the campus. So we're connecting to that. And at the request of DDOT, we're also making a connection to the western boundary of the campus and connecting to an existing sidewalk

NEAL R. GROSS

there. So a new sidewalk the entire length of the southern edge of campus feeding into the main new entrance to the campus.

Internal to the campus, sidewalks would be added to improve universal accessibility within the campus and also make a more walkable campus. And those would be added as projects are introduced.

Also around the perimeter, most of the campus is fenced currently. The University would like to complete that fencing by filling in some of the missing pieces. And they'd also like to introduce gates at all of the entrances. In case of an emergency, the campus could be secured.

One of the other community comments was about the fence on Foxhall Road which is currently about two or three feet inside the curb line. And the proposal is to replace that with a fence that's about 15 feet inside the curb line and embedded in existing landscape and enhanced with new landscape.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
11	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L 5	
L6 L7	
L 7	
L 8	

19

20

21

22

This is an enlargement plan of the W Street edge of campus. In the red outline is the current W Street parking lot and entrance drive which will be removed and replaced with landscape. So it'll go from being impervious surface to porous.

There's an opportunity then to add some landscaping screening along that W Street edge. You can also see the sidewalk and the emergency egress and gateway.

And I have a detailed plan next, I think. Yes.

The top two images are what the entrance would look like most of the time with the gate open for pedestrians to use. The lower left-hand shows the gate all the way open for a fire truck to enter the site. And then the final lower right image shows the gate closed in case of emergency.

This is a section through the site on Foxhall Road about mid-point on the campus showing Summers Hall on the far left, the

sloping condition. The existing fence is about on the property line just a few feet in from the curb as I mentioned before. The new fence location would be inboard about 15 feet and new landscape would be put in front of that, and existing landscape would be maintained behind it.

An enlargement of the Whitehaven entrance shows the sidewalk connection out to Foxhall, a larger pedestrian plaza at entrance near the gymnasium with a gracious set of stairs and also a handicap ramp that allows for universal accessibility up to the There are walls shown that would be campus. an opportunity to retain the grade but also identify the campus and this its main as entrance. You can see also the proposed street trees along Whitehaven and enhanced landscape at the entrance.

And finally, the landscape perimeter for the campus on the western side of the campus, the proposal is to keep that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

natural wooded area as it is. A couple of areas in the northern and southern corners would be managed woodland. The rest of the campus perimeter would be trees, enhanced added trees and lawn using native and adapted species.

And I'll turn it over to Kyle now.

MR. OLIVER: Good evening. I'm

Kyle Oliver from Vika Capitol, 4900

Massachusetts Avenue.

What we've done is looked at the storm water management for the site. with citizens. We met with the Department of the Environment, and also campus maintenance review the existing draining personnel to any existing overall site patterns and concerns from a storm water management and storm drain standpoint. Over the past year, we visited the site during numerous rainfall events to verify these drainage patterns and to review the existing outfalls.

There are two major drainage

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

divides on the site. Basically the site is
cut in two. The northern part of the site
drains down to an existing culvert under W
Street and drains down to an existing closed-
conduit system in W. And the southern part of
the site drains down to two closed-conduit
systems that outfall down into Whitehaven.
There is an existing sand filter associated
with the new Pelham building that treats the
adjacent area and Pelham building for storm
water management. The District did some
improvements along W Street. They've built a
new curb and draining inlets to help control
some of the water that flows down W Street.

Based on these meetings, our site visits and the improvements made in the early 2000s, the existing infrastructure can adequately handle the existing storm water that is released from the site. And therefore there is currently no adverse impact to the downstream areas of the campus.

As we discussed, one thing the

NEAL R. GROSS

University is planning on doing is removing the existing parking lot along W Street and installing the grass pave or reinforced turf as an access road. This will provide a reduction in run off from the campus and thus an improvement to storm water management for the campus.

University has developed storm water management plan that will designed to have a zero impact on the overall drainage storm water system both on development site basis as well as an aggregate This plan will be implemented on a basis. building-by-building basis over the course of the 2010 plan as new buildings are developed.

Potential storm water management technologies include one of the following or a combination of the following. They include green roofs, rain gardens, bio-swells, bio-retention areas, rain tank or infiltration areas, bio-retention boxes, cisterns and rain barrels, the grass paved area that we talked

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about, and sand filters or storm filters.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There's lot of variables involved in storm water management design, and therefore we want to be able to install the appropriate storm water management measure or maybe a future storm water management facility that hasn't been thought of yet for each site. So as each development area that you can see in green, we've located a couple of areas that they are potential for storm water management each building gets built. And these technologies will be reviewed to determine the appropriate method of storm water management for each site.

I'd like to turn it over to Jami in traffic.

MS. MILANOVICH: Good evening, Chairman Hood, Members of the Commission. My name is Jami Milanovich with Wells and Associates. We were the traffic consultants for the campus plan that is before you this evening.

We began the transportation study
back in September when we met with the DDOT to
discuss the scope of the study, the parameters
and methodology to be utilized in this study.
As a result of the meeting, we agreed to an
extensive study area which is shown on this
glido

There were eight intersections that we originally proposed to study. We added two that are shown in the yellow at the request of both DDOT and as a result of our meetings with the community.

A summary of the key findings of the study are as follows. The increase in enrollment associated with the campus plan will generate 58 a.m. peak hour vehicle trips and 37 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips. It is important to note that these trip generation numbers include the trips associated with the Pelham Hall which is currently under construction.

Traffic associated with the

NEAL R. GROSS

increased enrollment will account for less than one percent of the traffic at all of the study intersections. This increase in traffic would be virtually imperceptible at the study intersections.

The shuttle between the Mount Vernon and Foggy Bottom campus is widely used by both faculty, staff and students. The number of shuttle buses will be expanded as necessary during the peak periods accommodate the increased enrollment. The University will expand its existing TDM and parking management programs to ensure traffic neighborhood impacts to the are minimized.

The reason the impact associated with the Mount Vernon campus is de minimus is in large part because of the TDM program currently employed by the University. These TDM measures include the shuttle bus -- the Vern Express which I described previously that operates between the Foggy Bottom and Mount

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Vernon	campuses		they	have	a :	zipo	car	on
campus,	the Univ	ersit	y par	ticipa	tes	in	NuR	ide
which i	s a car	pool	ince	ntive	pro	grar	n,	the
Universi	ity offer	s re	duced	parki	ng	rate	es	for
registe	red carpo	ols,	the 1	Mount	Vern	on	cam	pus
offers	signific	ant	bicy	cle	park	ing,	,	the
Universi	ity has a	bicy	cle lo	oan pro	ogran	n, a	ınd	the
Universi	ity also	has	a s	shoppi	ng d	cart	: 1	oan
program	which al	lows	stude	ents t	o ch	eck	out	t a
shopping	g cart :	if t	hey're	e head	ding	OV	er	to
MacArthu	ır Boulev	ard	to do	some	sh	opp:	ing	so
that the	ey don't h	nave	to dri	ve the	eir v	zehi	cle	

In order to enhance the existing TDM program, the University will continue the existing TDM strategies, they will maintain shuttle bus service with a commitment to expand the number of buses as necessary during peak periods, they will provide preferential parking for carpools in the garage, and they will also provide preferential parking for hybrid vehicles.

The University also employs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

several	parking	mana	gement	str	ategi	es	to
ensure	the im	pact	to	the	surr	ound:	ing
communiti	es is	minim	nized.	Tì	ne p	oark:	ing
policies	current	ly in	place	e incl	ude	an (on-
campus pa	arking re	strict	ion po	olicy w	hich	sta [.]	tes
that all	. GW fa	culty,	staf	f, st	udent	ts a	and
visitors	must pa	rk on	campus	s. The	e pol	icy	is
available	e online	and	is al	.so gi	ven	to i	new
residents	of the	Mount	Verno	on camp	pus s	o tl	hat
they're a	ware of	the po	olicy.	GW al	.so ei	nfor	ces
the no	parking	on	campus	stre	ets	or	on
adjacent	streets	, and	they	place	fli	ers	on
vehicles	that are	e found	d to b	e affi	liate	ed w	ith
the Unive	ersity in	formin	g them	of th	e pol	Licy.	•
	Tn -		. + .	. +1			-i

addition the policies, GW will also maintain the ability to that reclaim parking spaces on campus currently are leased by the Lab School. will also monitor parking annually. When parking occupancy reaches 85 percent, University will implement additional measures such increasing the number parking as of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	spaces by employing attendant parking in
2	garage or potentially restricting freshmen
3	from bringing cars to campus. They will
4	continue to encourage the use of car sharing
5	service by students, and they will monitor the
6	demand for the car sharing service should it
7	become necessary to increase that in the
8	future.
9	In conclusion, the University's
0	commitment to transportation demand management
1	and parking management programs significantly

reduces auto-oriented trips to and from the Mount Vernon campus. As such, increases in traffic associated with the campus plan will have a negligible impact on the surrounding area.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Carl Elefonte to discuss the Ames building.

MR. ELEFONTE: Good evening, Chairman Hood and Commissioner Members. Му name is Carl Elefonte. I'm a principle with

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Quinn Evans Architects here in Washington,

D.C. And I'm serving as the design principle

for the renovation and addition project for

Ames Hall.

Ames Hall is located on Academic Building Site A4 on the Mount Vernon campus master plan. To the north is the central campus quadrangle. To the southeast is the softball field. To the east is Summers Hall. And to the west are the tennis courts, soccer field, parking garage, clock tower and a walkway connecting to the Pelham Hall project which is about completed.

Next slide, please.

This site diagram shows the existing footprint of Ames Hall in gray, and the proposed footprint in brown. The current square footage -- zoning gross square footage -- is 18,879 square feet. The proposed new building would be 45,765 zoning gross square feet which is a net increase of 26,886 gross square feet.

NEAL R. GROSS

Next slide, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

These photographs are of the existing Ames Hall viewed from the quadrangle to the north. And at the top of the campus is a steeply, sloping site.

Ames Hall is a two-story building with one basement level. It has brick masonry exterior walls, rows of punched double-hung windows and hipped slate roof. There is a terrace nestled between the east and west wings of Ames Hall overlooking the quad.

Next slide, please.

Hall Ames will serve as linking crossroads the campus together. on all four Building entrances will occur faces of the building and all levels except for the top floor. Ames Hall will be the first building constructed to reorient it to the Mount Vernon campus proposed Whitehaven Parkway entrance. This view shows a photo montage of the proposed Ames Hall addition viewed from from the campus entrance

Whitehave	n Parkway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Next slide, please.

This is the proposed west elevation showing the existing Ames Hall building to the left and the proposed addition stepping to the right. The addition to Ames Hall is designed to take advantage of its sloping site, which drops more than 30 feet from the quad.

The top two floors of the proposed addition generally align with the floors of the existing building. And the eave of the proposed main roof aligns with the existing roof.

The first basement is somewhat than the elevation of the existing lower Two basement levels step down the basement. below the level of the existing slope basement.

Ames Hall remains a student service center adjacent to the central academic quad on the Mount Vernon campus

continuing to provide the student mailroom and small cafe. Most of the space in the proposed Ames Hall will contain academic spaces including a variety of classrooms, seminar rooms and other study rooms. Ames Hall will also contain faculty offices for two academic units and other support spaces for the Mount Vernon campus, most notably the offices for the campus police.

Next slide.

This view shows a photo montage of the proposed Ames Hall viewed from the softball field. Facing north onto the central academic quad, the existing Ames Hall building will continue to frame the south edge of the quad. The proposed renovations and addition will not significantly alter the current condition.

The overall architectural approach for the proposed addition is to establish compatibility with the existing campus architecture while also differentiating the

NEAL R. GROSS

new construction. It is designed following the campus master plan guidelines noted earlier.

To reiterate those, the character-defining design elements of the existing campus are buildings constructed with brick walls and articulated massing forming bars, Ls

9 height.

Most roofs are pitched with either slate or metal roofing. Most roof forms are hipped with some gabled and mono-pitch roof elements around the campus.

and Us ranging from two to four stories in

There's a wide variety of fenestration ranging from rows of punched windows, mostly in the residential buildings, to clusters of larger windows and projecting bay windows.

The proposed addition to Ames Hall establishes compatibility by articulating the building into a series of brick-clad blocks at a heightened scale consistent with the

NEAL R. GROSS

existing and surround buildings. Capping the
main building block is a hipped, pitch roof,
stepping the height of the building down to
the south as the addition steps down the
sloping site.

I've brought a sample board with me illustrating the exterior materials if you're interested in seeing them. A photo of the sample board is included in the packet of the revised Ames Hall drawings.

proposed exterior material pallet consists of brick in a tone somewhat lighter and less the existing red than building. You can see that there are many brick colors used on the campus and falling into the mid to dark, red to brown range.

Roofing of the sloped roofs will be a synthetic slate. Accent panels and other accents will be exposed elements -- pre-cast concrete elements, I should say.

The design is shaped by

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sustainable design considerations as The existing Ames Hall building is retained and upgraded to meet contemporary performance standards. The hipped roof forms of the Ames Hall building are reflected with roofs that project beyond the walls below shading the top story windows where offices requiring closelyspaced windows are located. Windows at the academic spaces are provided in larger clusters to harvest daylight for the building interior.

Next slide, please.

This slide shows a roof plan of the existing Ames Hall and proposed addition. And it includes the existing hipped slate roof of Ames Hall at the top of the slide, the proposed atrium roof separating the main block of the addition from the existing building, the synthetic slate hipped roof over the main block of the building, the penthouse which is in the middle of that area on the main block containing both the mechanical equipment and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

elevator overrun penthouses. The roof over the south wing is comprised both of a hipped synthetic slate perimeter and a vegetative green roof covering most of the south wing.

The scale of the proposed addition is designed to be compatible with existing Ames Hall and campus setting resulting in a narrow block where the penthouse is located. Therefore, the required one-to-one setback within that building block for the roof structure is not achieved.

By working with the Office of Planning staff, alternatives were considered to optimize the location, size, shape and treatment of the proposed penthouse. The proposed penthouse shown here in a revised drawing and in the revised drawing packet that you have reduces the width and height of the previously proposed penthouse substantially.

In their report, the Office of Planning staff noted the possibility that we would be seeking relief for the number of roof

NEAL R. GROSS

1	structures proposed. With the revised
2	penthouse shown, that is not required here.
3	This concludes my testimony.
4	Thank you.
5	MR. AVITABILE: All right. Thank
6	you.
7	Thank you for your time this
8	evening. As we conclude, I just wanted to
9	take some time to address outstanding issues
10	in some of the agency reports.
11	First regarding the ANC 3-D
12	report, as shown in our proposed conditions
13	and implementation schedule that we submitted
14	at the opening of the hearing, we've
15	integrated all of the ANC's requests with some
16	minor changes except for one regarding
17	enrollment.
18	ANC 3-D had proposed phasing in
19	the proposed enrollment increase essentially
20	to give I think the ANC the ability to monitor
21	the impact of the students incrementally. The
22	University, however, continues to request the

proposed increase of 15 percent on a headcount basis and ten percent on an FTE basis immediately upon approval.

the Commission is aware, the Court of Appeals has recently reminded us that student enrollment caps approach the limits of what's permitted under the zoning regulations because they intrude on the University's educational mission. Because of this, they should only be imposed to the extent they're prohibit the necessary to objectionable impacts under Section 210.

Here the ANC has not demonstrated that the proposed 15 percent increase would actually impose any objectionable impacts. And so there's no basis to lower the University's requested cap.

I would also note that the BZA recently rejected a similar request by ANC 3-D for a lower enrollment cap for a nearby private school for the same reasons essentially. You can't just impose a lower

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cap just because you want to monitor how the enrollment is phased in.

Regarding the OP report, we reviewed OP's requested conditions, and with some minor changes we have adopted all of these conditions. And they're in those conditions and the implementation schedule that are before you.

finally regarding then report which the Commission I'm received, discussed earlier, has as significant integrated number of а improvements into this campus plan that will improve pedestrian mobility and safety within and around the campus.

Most significantly, the University will install sidewalk а new along its Whitehaven Parkway frontage. The University had initially proposed the sidewalk just from primary Whitehaven entrance down to Foxhall Road. at DDOT's request, But expanded that also include a to second

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

entrance to the campus' western boundary which creates a continuous sidewalk from Foxhall all the way to the edge of the campus. And this is really I think an important part of GW's effort to continue to strengthen the Whitehaven entrance as the primary entrance to the campus.

As Jami Milanovich had discussed earlier, GW also operates an aggressive TDM on the Mount Vernon campus that has and will continue to manage the traffic and parking impacts of the proposed University use. And as Jami mentioned, the University provides the Vern Express Shuttle which provides direct express service between the two campuses, the University has somewhere between 83 and 97 bicycle parking spaces available on the campus both inside and outside of buildings once Pelham comes on line, and also offers a bike loan program for students who don't own a bike, the University has that relatively novel

NEAL R. GROSS

shopping cart loan program so that students can walk down to the Safeway to get their groceries, the University subsidizes the provision of a zipcar on campus, and the University proposes and runs a carpool program.

This is a very aggressive TDM program that truly promotes a car-free diet for students. And this is evidenced by the fact that there are only a handful of students that bring cars to this campus.

And as an aside -- but I think it's an interesting one -- GW's policies here have even encouraged some of the nearby residents to follow suit, and they now use the Vern Express to get to and from work as well.

We think that some of DDOT's additional TDM suggestions that they proposed in their report are good ideas. And going forward, the University will continue to explore whether they could be added to its already robust program. However, DDOT hasn't

provided any evidence that its recommendations 1 2 be added in order remedy must to 3 objectionable traffic or parking impact. 4 Therefore, the University declines to adopt DDOT's additional recommendations 5 at 6 time. And with that, I think we conclude 7

And with that, I think we conclude our presentation. And we are happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Avitabile.

I just have two quick questions.

Ms. Milanovich, you mentioned that you were going to reclaim the parking spaces for Lab School. And I'm trying to remember and I didn't sit on that case. But I think they just had a case in front of the BZA or sometime back. And I was just wondering if those parking spaces were already accounted for under that order. And I'm just curious heard you going to because Ι say you're reclaim the parking spaces or something

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	dealing with Lab School.
2	MS. MILANOVICH: Currently the Lab
3	School leases some parking spaces in the GW
4	garage. And all we're saying is that they
5	need to maintain the ability to reclaim those
6	in the future should they ever need them.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So you're
8	not going to reclaim automatically
9	MS. MILANOVICH: That's correct.
10	Only if they would come to a situation where
11	they would need more parking spaces for their
12	own use.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And my next
14	question is more of being nosy. My days are
15	numbered so it doesn't matter what questions I
16	ask now.
17	Ms. O'Neil, have you always been
18	the Senior Associate Vice President?
19	MS. O'NEIL: I have been my
20	title has changed a number of times over the
21	years. I've held that title since April of
22	2009

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well,
2	congratulations.
3	MS. O'NEIL: Well, thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. That's
5	all the questions I have. I'll open it up to
6	my colleagues for any questions.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just wanted
8	to follow one line. The Lab School spaces,
9	are they actually required for zoning purposes
10	for the Lab School to meet their zoning?
11	Don't know?
12	MS. MILANOVICH: I'm sorry. I
13	don't know that.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. It'd be
15	helpful to know that to know how that
16	relates. And if somebody in the audience
17	actually knows the answer to that, we'd be
18	happy to hear what they have to say when the
19	time comes. But if you could find that out
20	for us ultimately, I think I'm curious about
21	that.

NEAL R. GROSS

Also, it was mentioned --

1	MR. AVITABILE: Actually, if you
2	want, we can answer that question about the
3	Lab School spaces now.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
5	MR. AVITABILE: As I understand
6	it, for Lab School now on an interim basis
7	until Lab School has the opportunity to build
8	some new parking on its own campus. And I
9	think that application is going to be pending
10	in the near future.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Soon they will
12	probably build the spaces on their campus so
13	that that they won't need these?
14	MR. AVITABILE: That's correct.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And I
16	assume that you wouldn't take them away while
17	they're still needed? That's a head movement.
18	I'm not getting a clear message. I'm sorry.
19	All right. Very good. We don't
20	want to solve one problem and create another.
21	Did I understand correctly that
22	the neighbors get to use the Vern Express at

1	no charge?
2	MS. O'NEIL: Yes, that's correct.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: That's very
4	nice.
5	Now, Mr. Avitabile, you made the
6	case that ANC 3-D's proposal for the phased
7	increase is not something that would be
8	required or something that could be required
9	simply for the sake of monitoring it. But
10	that is something that the University could
11	agree to on its own, is it not?
12	MR. AVITABILE: The University
13	could agree to that. But the University does
14	not at this time.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And just
16	out of curiosity, as I understand it, the 2000
17	plan never reached the cap there, is that
18	right?
19	MR. AVITABILE: I don't believe it
20	reached the cap though it did come close both
21	on a headcount and on an FTE basis. I think
22	another consideration is that the Pelham

1	dormitory is going to come online I believe
2	this fall and add 287 new residents to the
3	campus. So when you're looking at that chart
4	that was in our presentation and you add 287
5	to that, you see we again start to come very
6	close to our numbers.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: The current cap
8	or the proposed new cap?
9	MR. AVITABILE: The current cap.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: The current
11	cap. Okay.
12	And when do you actually project
13	that you'll meet or that you'll need that new
14	cap or a cap beyond what ANC 3-D would like
15	you to have?
16	MS. O'NEIL: With the addition of
17	the Pelham Building, we will be nearing or at
18	the current 1500 cap. With the addition of
19	the Ames Hall project to the campus, the
20	additional classroom space and the additional
21	capacity for students on the campus, we
22	envision at that point we will exceed the 1500

1	cap and quickly approach the ANC's number.
2	And the University is concerned about being in
3	a position of exceeding that number and hence
4	our request to have the 15 percent increase in
5	headcount and ten percent on an FTE basis.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: And when do you
7	project that you'd actually build the Ames
8	Hall?
9	MS. O'NEIL: We would seek to
10	begin constructing the project immediately
11	upon approval of this campus plan and the
12	migration of the functions that are currently
13	in Ames which will move to the new Pelham
14	Building. So as early as this fall.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All
16	right. I don't think I have a lot of
17	questions about the plan overall of those few
18	small points.
19	I do have a couple of comments
20	about the relief required for the penthouse.
21	And I'm not sure that there really are answers
22	to this. I mean, I see how the penthouse has

evolved from its original form. And I think it has clearly improved over the sequence of iterations. But I think that there's one image in particular which I think is a great concern. And I'd love to comment on the entirety of the architecture of the building. But given that this is just a campus plan and penthouse relief, I will restrain myself and I won't even ask to touch the materials board, which I normally do.

But there's the image that gives us the entry from Whitehaven that shows the proposed front of the Ames Building, or that side of the Ames Building. I guess the original building would still be the front. There we go. That one. No. Yes, that image.

And it doesn't show up that well where it's washed out like this. But in the version that we have, the penthouse really looks like a very foreign object in that roof.

And I imagine that's one of the issues that you're struggling with from a design

NEAL R. GROSS

perspective. And I'm just wondering if there is further work that needs to be done -- no, I'm sorry -- not wondering. I'm sure there's further work that needs to be done to make it have a purpose to be there.

I mean, it seems like it's just a big, blank gray box jutting out of the roof of an otherwise perfect form. And it is a very perfect form. And I guess this is part of the problem of pitched roofs — particularly pitched roofs on buildings with relatively large floor plates and a steep roof, and you wind up with a lot of roof. It'd be a different thing if the angles were different or if you had more flat roof. And maybe some component of this building really does need to have a flat roof in order to handle that penthouse. I'm not sure.

I don't want to disagree with whatever advice you'll be getting from the Office of Planning. And I have no problem with the concept that the relief is needed

NEAL R. GROSS

1	given the footprint that you're dealing with
2	or the nature of the building that you're
3	dealing with. I think it's pretty clearly
4	needed. But I don't think that you have the
5	right solution yet design-wise. And I'm not
6	sure there's anything you can do to answer
7	that comment.
8	I just would say that it's not
9	there yet particularly given this perspective
10	because I think this is a very, very important
11	view once the shell trailer gets out of the
12	way and you've got the nice gate in place.
13	But it will be a really nice view. And it
14	just is so prominent this big gray blank
15	facade.
16	So I don't know if you want to say
17	anything to respond to that.
18	MR. ELEFONTE: Just that I
19	appreciate the comments. I'm not wondering
20	how in the world you could have ever made

COMMISSIONER MAY: I could only

NEAL R. GROSS

those comments.

21

22

imagine what a struggle it's been because it seems like it's a very, very big penthouse on a building that's too small for it. Maybe the answer is that part of the building actually has to be taller, and more of the footprint of the building needs to be on another floor or something. I don't know. I'm not sure how you work it out. But something's not quite right yet.

MR. ELEFONTE: Two quick observations. One is that literally making it more prominent was in response to one of the comments we had from staff. So it literally went in that direction to respond to that comment.

But the second is that we've looked at a number of alternatives where it's really long and narrow. And I think that we all feel that a solution like this that breaks up the ridge of the existing roof -- excuse me the proposed roof -- of so that it's two blocks instead actually of one is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	helpful. And what it leaves us with then is
2	the need to solve the architect tonics of the
3	penthouse itself.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I would
5	say that's generally right. At least looking
6	at the long versions of the penthouse that
7	were in the previous drawings, that's pretty
8	clear. And I think the idea of it being a
9	relatively compact form that breaks up the
LO	mass I think is also a good direction.
11	But there's not enough stuff there
L2	to show that it has some purpose to be there.
L3	It needs to have some purpose not just
L4	mechanically, but visually. And it's just not
L 5	there yet.
L 6	So good luck. I hope to see new
L7	versions of that. So, thanks.
L 8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
L 9	questions? Commissioner Turnbull?
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
21	Mr. Chair.
22	I want to thank you for an

excellent presentation on your campus plan. I think there's a lot of outstanding elements in it.

I have a question -- a couple of questions. One of them is in page eight of your Exhibit 2 when you talk about measuring heights. We talk about you're limited to 90 feet, but then you go through this whole --"For campus planning purposes, the University has portrayed the height of both existing buildings based on a measurement from the building front the top of the to inclusive of architectural embellishments for mechanical equipment enclosures, and While this is not the methodology penthouses. used to formally calculate height under the zoning regulations, this approach to height measurement has been used in order to provide the community with a more clear understanding of the height of the proposed buildings. buildings, of course, will comply with the District's zoning regulations."

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	So I guess I'm wondering. On a
2	lot of your sections, it's hard to really read
3	what the height is.
4	MR. AVITABILE: Right.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I see
6	elevations, but it's hard to know where zero
7	is so you know exactly if it's 90 feet or not.
8	So I just feel it looks like they're all
9	under 90 feet.
10	MR. AVITABILE: Oh, absolutely.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It looks
12	like they're all under 90 feet.
13	MR. AVITABILE: The tallest
14	building is 60 feet, and that's 60 feet
15	including the penthouse.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I can
17	understand your concern about letting the
18	neighbors know exactly what you're trying to
19	do. But I would just suggest that in the
20	future as you're setting it in for the Zoning
21	Commission, at least give us that benefit of
22	the doubt for that height measurement T

1	understand where you're coming from. But it's
2	just nice to go back and look at it the other
3	way too.
4	MR. AVITABILE: Absolutely.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The noise
6	issue with the soccer field, and I think
7	Marsha Lea was talking about that. Is there a
8	berm or how are you accommodating the noise
9	issue going on the street?
10	MR. BELL: Do you want to go to
11	the site plan?
12	MS. O'NEIL: I can respond.
13	In response to the request from
14	our neighbors across W Street, the University
15	has agreed to build a ten-foot wall a
16	sound-attenuating wall on the north side of
17	the soccer field to help remediate the
18	sound.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is that
20	brick?
21	MS. O'NEIL: Yes. It's a brick-
22	like. It appears to be brick. It's not an

1	entirely brick wall however.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. The
3	fence material? Wrought iron or cast aluminum
4	or something? The fence looks like a wrought
5	iron or some kind of metal variation of that.
6	MS. O'NEIL: On which? I'm sorry.
7	On which drawing?
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, no.
9	You talked about the fence around the whole
10	campus. And then the last one where you're
11	showing on Whitehaven, it looked like the
12	fence was the gate it looked like it was
13	wrought iron, which I assume is matching
14	what's on the campus.
15	MS. LEA: The campus now has a
16	chain-link fence for the most part.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Nice.
18	MS. LEA: What we're proposing is
19	an ornamental picket fence at the gates only
20	and probably a vinyl-clad chain-link fence in
21	the landscape which tends to disappear more
22	than a picket fence does when it's placed

1	within the landscape which is what we're
2	proposing, not in front of the landscape.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. But
4	you're not replacing all the fences
5	MS. LEA: No.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: around
7	the campus? Just areas that are devoid of
8	them now?
9	MS. LEA: Primarily along Foxhall
LO	where the fence is out at the curb. We're
11	pulling that back and embedding it into the
12	landscape. But we're not suggesting that the
L3	fence on the west side of the property be
L 4	replaced.
L 5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
L 6	When you were talking about the storm water
L7	management and zero impact, what percent of
L 8	the storm water are you managing? Is there
L 9	going to be even though the street's been
20	repaired. I remember it seems like years ago
21	when we talked about on W Street with the

impact down the street, the neighbors were

2	whatever. Run off is still going to be going
3	in there.
4	MR. OLIVER: Correct.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But what
6	percentage do you feel you're retaining of the
7	whole site?
8	MR. OLIVER: What we're going to
9	do is look on a case-by-case basis.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
11	MR. OLIVER: Each building, we're
12	going to assume that is its own site, if you
13	will, and look at what different types
14	depends on the type of construction of the
15	building whether or not we can put a green
16	roof in it, whether or not the soils are
17	infiltratable. So that's why we kind of left
18	it a little bit open so that we can kind of
19	pick and choose depending on what site
20	constraints we have.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
22	MR. OLIVER: But the zero impact

concerned about the water and it backed up or

1	would be you would not be able to increase the
2	peak runoff from that particular site.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How about
4	on the new proposed A4 building Ames
5	addition? How about that? You show the green
6	on one of your diagrams. It showed a green
7	stretch there. Is that being used?
8	MR. OLIVER: That's an area I
9	would assume we're probably going to end up
LO	with sand filter just because of the
11	topography in the street. I doesn't really
12	lead itself well to a bio-retention are or a
L3	rain garden. So actually
L 4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you're
15	never really going to use any like cisterns
L 6	trying to recycle groundwater for sprinklers?
L7	MR. OLIVER: We could look at that
18	potential for each site as it's brought on.
L 9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. So
20	you really haven't got any definitive
21	MR. OLIVER: Correct. We want to
22	leave the options open because like I said if

1	some of the soils don't infiltrate, then you
2	don't want really want to do an infiltration
3	site. You don't want to do a bio-retention
4	area.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
6	MR. OLIVER: It may lend itself to
7	a different type of storm water management.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You're
9	going for a LEED certification on the
10	buildings? Just certification? Are you going
11	to silver or right now just shooting for
12	certification?
13	MS. O'NEIL: Our commitment in the
14	campus plan for LEED certification. As we've
15	done in the past, the University has set a
16	baseline commitment and sought to overshoot
17	that commitment with new buildings. For
18	example, on the Pelham Building, we had
19	committed to a minimum of 16 LEED points on
20	that project.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
22	MS O'NEIL. And it is currently

1	tracking at LEED gold.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Very good.
3	Let me look down my list here.
4	On the student count issue, I
5	guess going back to that Exhibit 2 if this
6	was at Foggy Bottom, we'd have a lot more
7	questions coming from the audience, I'm sure.
8	But under 6.2.4 and I see Ms.
9	Gates is in the audience, so I'm sure she
10	would have been raising her hand. I'm just
11	curious about the number. When you talk about
12	the different ways of doing this, if this was
13	Foggy Bottom, I'm sure we'd have people saying
14	you're hiding something. I don't mean to
15	discredit what's going on at Foggy Bottom, but
16	what is your methodology? Why did you
17	approach it this way for this campus?
18	MS. O'NEIL: With respect to the
19	daily and semester counts specifically, is
20	that the onus of your question?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
22	MS. O'NEIL: Yes. The University

historically counted students on a daily basis -- the number of students that can be enrolled in a course on a daily basis. At the beginning of the planning process, the University sought to change that to a semester basis which is comparable to how report for regulatory IPEDS, we different reportings on our enrollment. Based on our dialogue with the community and the ANC, we've withdrawn our position on that and are comfortable moving ahead counting on a daily basis moving forward with the enrollment increases that we discussed.

Well, COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Ι don't see a breakdown. But I just remember when we were back at Foggy Bottom, you had to list how many workers, how many temporary classified people, who was as full professor, who was a full-time FE. see that kind of a nitty gritty breakdown here although as I say it was done previously at the other campus.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. O'NEIL: We have a slightly
2	simpler methodology at the Mount Vernon
3	campus. Every student who is a resident of
4	that campus is counted as both one on a
5	headcount basis each and everyday of the week,
6	and one on a full-time equivalency basis each
7	and everyday of the week. Students who are
8	not residents of the campus are counted based
9	upon their course load at the campus, if they
10	come to campus and take one course they are
11	counted as one on a headcount basis, and in
12	most cases it would be one quarter of a
13	student on a full-time equivalency basis.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, okay.
15	MS. O'NEIL: So it's the summation
16	of those two elements that make up the campus
17	population count on the campus.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now do you
19	report those numbers to the ANC then on an
20	annual basis? Or what do you
21	MS. O'NEIL: We had not
22	previously, though we

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I'm
2	just curious.
3	MS. O'NEIL: though we have
4	proposed
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You do at
6	Foggy Bottom I think.
7	MS. O'NEIL: Yes. We report twice
8	a year at Foggy Bottom.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: As I say,
10	this hearing is a little different than if it
11	was Foggy Bottom.
12	MS. O'NEIL: We have proposed to
13	provide that information to the community each
14	fall in November under this campus plan.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
16	Thank you.
17	I guess I'd like to just pick up
18	then on a line of questioning that Mr. May had
19	been going and dealing with Building A4, the
20	Ames addition.
21	And I grew up in Oak Park,
22	Illinois which is prairie school capitol of

America. And this building would fit in very well. The linear ribbon windows, the overhang, the massing is very -- well, to me it seems very prairie school. But it fits in. There is a nice blend to it.

But I would echo Mr. May's concern that the penthouse -- and I like building. I think there's an elegant solution here working. And I like the ribbon windows like the overhang. Ι like detailing. But I think -- and it's whether it's that one shot that you showed before from Whitehaven Parkway, or what's more telling is the view across the softball field. And it looks like somebody just whited out something. It looks like something was erased, that we weren't sure what we were doing, or how to deal with this element in this wonderful roof and this roofline with the windows.

And you almost want to have some type of detailing up there. You'll either want to just either continue the line across

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

where the roof is or you want to do something
to make it seem a little bit more horizontal.
It just seems that it's missing something to
complete it. I think that that elevation
looks I like the massing of that building.
But I think the penthouse just leaves it
it's like you're still thinking about it and
you haven't really finalized it.
And as I say, with the details
that you've got, I think you could find an
element in there that you maybe repeat or at
least the linearity of it that might help take
away from the fact that it just seems to be
standing there by itself. It's almost

And anyway, I'm just throwing that out there. It just seems like as Mr. May said that there's just something missing there.

MR. **ELEFONTE:** The Commission are extremely perceptive about the Members state of the penthouse design. I mean, this has been a conversation that's been going on

NEAL R. GROSS

independent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

over the last couple of weeks with staff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Again, I would just reiterate what I said before that there were many linear techniques that were used including the which completely hid previous the one penthouse from the south elevation. You couldn't see it at all. It was completely contained beyond the ridge of the roof on the other side -- the north side. So it was almost invisible.

But what it resulted in was an uninterrupted south roof. And in the opinion of staff -- and actually I would concur with that opinion -- it actually improves the massing of the building to interrupt that roofline with the penthouse.

Now the question is what should the detail of the penthouse be so that it's not a whited out element which your comment is well taken. And so I think that the basic gesture -- it's actually I really appreciate the input from staff. I think it's helped by

	breaking up that root room, and that it is
2	exactly as you described it. It's a
3	placeholder.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
5	think it's a wonderful place for a very
6	elegant building. I think it's really going
7	to stand out when it's complete. But I just
8	think that some of the detailing that you've
9	got I mean, again, what we're seeing here
10	is a very stages of this and the drawings I
11	know are not complete. But from what we're
12	looking at, it does fit in with my comments
13	being prairie school or not. I think there's
14	an aspect to it that really fits in. I just
15	think that it would really set this campus off
16	in this corner. But it's one of those God is
17	in the details. And that penthouse just needs
18	a little something.
19	But I think as it is, you're going
20	in the right direction. Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
22	Commissioner Schlater?

1	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Thank you
2	very much, Chairman Hood.
3	And thank you to the Applicant for
4	all the leg work you did leading up to this
5	hearing tonight. It makes it a lot easier on
6	us when you've had many, many meetings with
7	the community and worked out the issues before
8	you've got here. And I think it sounds like
9	most of those issues have been worked out.
10	We do have one party who's
11	concerned about the A1 building. I guess I
12	have two questions on the A1 building.
13	Have you had discussions with this
14	particular party? And could you maybe talk
15	about some of the concerns that have been
16	raised regarding height and location of the
17	building?
18	MS. O'NEIL: I'll answer the first
19	component and then perhaps Matt can talk about
20	height of the building.
21	With respect to discussions with
22	Mr. Pashaian, we have not discussions with him

1	ā
2	€
3	r
4	t
5	F
6	
7	€
8	
9	k
10	5
11	r
12	
13	€
14	
15	נ
16	t
17	5
18	V
19	r
20	5

22

about this. I received an email yesterday evening on the topic. But we had not previously discussed this matter during any of those community meetings or throughout the process.

I do know, however -- and Matt can expound on this -- that we did a lot of work during the process on the massing of that building, the height of that building, the setback that's proposed on that building. And perhaps Matt can expound a bit on that.

MR. BELL: Yes. This is an exhibit we showed before.

This is A1. And what we have is a little bit washed out. We have the heights — the tallest point of the building is on W Street along on the campus here, and also what we're proposing. So 320 is what we're proposing which would be at its tallest point shorter than the Eckels Library.

And we spent -- you're perceptive in asking the question because we did spend a

lot of time on this corner looking at this, both in terms of the building and also in terms of landscaping.

One thing I would hasten to point well is we're not asking for out as changes to the existing boundaries. So this is 60 feet, and then it increases to 90 on the So that is a healthy amount of corner. there for setback mature and growing а landscape.

Maybe I could ask Eric -- and you can see -- okay -- what we're showing is where the outline of it might be -- and then we're showing the footprint based upon what we're saying is the massing of the building as it stands right now.

Maybe Eric, you could go to the exhibits that we didn't show because we did bring them tonight -- some exhibits we shared with the community to talk about the height here and to make it clear how this would be understood in several different ways.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Yes. Let's go to the first one there. That one. Yes.

These section drawings two are you're going to see. One is an elevation drawing. The first one's an elevation drawing I believe pretty much along Foxhall there looking west. And you'll be able to see the relative degree of the height of A1 relative library and the street to the and buildings across the street. And then we have a section through that to show the relative massing within the building as the topography of the campus changes to the west.

So here's what you can see in this elevation/section along Foxhall Road. Here's Eckels Library -- the highest point there. Okay? This is Al. Note it's lower as we're showing here. And then this is the elevation of the highest point of this building on the corner -- 311 there -- with the campus fence there. The closest edge we're showing of this building Al is 190 feet from the residential

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

property at that corner.

We're showing as well the various elevations here for clarity's sake, as well as I believe this shows -- I can't quite read the dimensions there -- oh, yes -- 30 feet here for this lower portion which we're calling the setback to the point at which the roof can occur for the mechanical system there. And then showing this -- 48 feet there. So at 30 feet plus 18 feet of a mechanical penthouse there.

Next slide.

This is a section through the campus out to the W Street. And this shows the same information in a slightly different rendition. Because you'll note number 1 -- here's W Street -- the topography falls as it comes down because the building's sitting lower automatically there to begin with.

So here's 311 on the corner. There's the campus fence -- again, 190 feet away.

1	Now the crucial thing, the design
2	guideline says 40-foot setback from that
3	northern face there. So what we're doing is
4	what you would see here, and we would have a
5	picture if this is an occupiable floor
6	but we could have dormers and other kinds of
7	things there and windows that would be useful
8	in letting light into that building. But what
9	we're showing is a 40-foot setback there to
10	step the massing back away from that corner.
11	And we really feel that this does
12	a very sufficient and good job of minimizing
13	that impact of making sure that we have a
14	generous amount of area there for planting and
15	landscape those two exhibits do.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Are those
17	design guidelines part of the plan package?
18	MR. BELL: Yes. It's mentioned
19	specifically the setback from the north side
20	the 40 feet.
21	MR. AVITABILE: Commissioner
22	Schlater, I think in Exhibit O of Exhibit 2.

1	And tonight we submitted an updated version
2	that also includes the condition about design
3	of restructures that OP had requested. So you
4	should have it both in the book Exhibit O, and
5	then in the additional pieces of paper that
6	were handed out tonight.
7	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: The
8	mechanical penthouse is set back 40 feet. Is
9	that
10	MR. AVITABILE: Yes, that's it.
11	MR. BELL: It's in there.
12	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: So how
13	does this A1 building compare in height to the
14	previously approved campus plan?
15	MR. BELL: In this corner, I
16	believe, you would have had 40 feet plus an
17	18-foot mechanical penthouse, I believe in the
18	2000 plan. Correct me if I'm wrong, David.
19	MR. AVITABILE: That's generally
20	correct.
21	What was called for over there
22	were two 40,000-square foot residential

1	dormitories that you see on that old plan that
2	are roughly L-shaped. And in their place, we
3	have one 35,000 square-foot academic building.
4	And I think that about that's right the
5	height 40 feet? Forty feet, three stories.
6	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: And this
7	one goes to it's three stories.
8	MR. AVITABILE: Yes, it's three
9	stories.
10	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Plus the
11	
12	MR. AVITABILE: And then the
13	mechanical penthouse.
14	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: the
15	mechanical penthouse.
16	MR. BELL: About 48 from this
17	point here.
18	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: So the
19	building has because of its institutional
20	I guess because it's is it classroom
21	space or is it office space? You don't know?
22	MR. AVITABILE: Precisely. But

1	it's academic, administrative use one or
2	the other.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: It's a
4	slightly larger footprint than the building
5	was before, but the same height? Would that
6	be a fair characterization?
7	MR. AVITABILE: Well, first there
8	were two buildings.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: There were
10	two buildings. So now it's one larger
11	building.
12	MR. AVITABILE: And actually, it's
13	smaller. The two buildings previously were
14	40,000 square feet each. This is 35,000
15	square feet.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Total.
17	MR. AVITABILE: So it's both a
18	little bit smaller. I'd say it's about
19	roughly the same height comparable to the
20	same height.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay.
22	That's good. That helps me on that issue.

1	Thank you.
2	Then I just want to quickly touch
3	on the ANC's issue with respect to headcount.
4	And could you call up the slide that shows
5	the headcount totals today projected?
6	So if I'm to understand this
7	correctly, right now you're at 1148. That's
8	your daily student headcount.
9	MS. O'NEIL: That is the student
10	headcount on the day that is most populated on
11	the campus which in fall of 2009, which is
12	when these numbers were run, was a Monday.
13	So yes, that is the maximum number
14	of students enrolled on the campus on a given
15	day, which is Monday.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: And I have
17	to go to my cheat sheet. Headcount equals
18	people who live there and go to school and go
19	to classes there?
20	MS. O'NEIL: Yes. The number of
21	residents plus the number of individuals that
22	come to the campus for a course on that day.

1	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: So, over
2	the coming years, you expect 352 new an
3	increase in headcount of 352 because of the
4	new residence halls that are on there, and the
5	new classroom space that's going online at
6	a minimum?
7	MS. O'NEIL: We'll have an
8	increase of approximately 300 this coming fall
9	when the Pelham Building is online and
10	populated with students. So that will reach
11	
12	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay. That's good. That's helpful the 300.
13	That's good. That's helpful the 300.
13	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be
13 14 15	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be living on campus when the Pelham Building
13 14 15 16	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be living on campus when the Pelham Building comes online?
13 14 15 16	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be living on campus when the Pelham Building comes online? MS. O'NEIL: Up to approximately
13 14 15 16 17	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be living on campus when the Pelham Building comes online? MS. O'NEIL: Up to approximately 700.
13 14 15 16 17 18	That's good. That's helpful the 300. How many people are going to be living on campus when the Pelham Building comes online? MS. O'NEIL: Up to approximately 700. COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Seven

MS. (1
That's correct.	2
COMMI	3
I think I ca	4
perspective of	5
the next couple	6
the campus. The	7
1148. That's a	8
current populati	9
What'	10
to say let's see	11
of students an	12
before approving	13
MS. (14
of things. The	15
fall of 2005 dur	16
University was r	17
So the communi	18

MS. O'NEIL: On a headcount basis.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay. So I think I can looking at it from the perspective of the ANC, you've got coming in the next couple of years 352 students on to the campus. That's a pretty big jump from 1148. That's almost a third increase in the current population on campus.

What's wrong with their proposal to say let's see how it goes with this influx of students and see what the impacts are before approving the increase in the cap?

MS. O'NEIL: I would note a couple of things. The first would be that in the fall of 2005 during the term of this plan, the University was near its 1500 headcount limit. So the community has had an opportunity to see what that impact is. And I don't believe there have been any statements that there has been an objectionable impact.

With respect to the students who

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

21

come to the campus for courses, very few of those students drive. They utilize the Vern Express Shuttle. We've addressed the noise. We've addressed every issue that has been raised with respect to what might objectionable about those students. So that is why we believe that what we have requested is reasonable and within what the ANC and the community can anticipate on the campus we've been there in the past.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: And then you're proposing for it to go up to 1750. And that's just as a result of the expansion of the campus. The proposed development on site is going to accommodate more folks.

MS. O'NEIL: The additional 15 percent from 1500 to 1725 would be both the net 100 new residents on the campus. That would get us to 800 campus residents, and then also additional students who may come to the campus for courses in those new academic buildings.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Somewhere
2	in the package, I saw a reference to a 3,000
3	number. There's a lot of different metrics
4	going on there. What's the 3,000 number?
5	MS. O'NEIL: The University, as I
6	had mentioned to Commissioner Turnbull
7	earlier, had proposed at the start of the
8	planning process counting students on a
9	semester basis, which would yield a higher
10	number than counting students on a daily
11	basis. That's what the 3,000 number referred
12	to. We have since withdrawn that request and
13	agreed with the community that we would
14	continue to count on a daily basis. Everyone
15	seems comfortable with that, and we can
16	accommodate that.
17	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay.
18	Great. Thank you.
19	The Ames Hall I won't go into
20	it. I'm not an architectural expert. But I
21	think I'll just echo the comments of my fellow
22	Commissioners and say that needs some work. I

1	think when you look at that building, it looks
2	like a good building.
3	The relief that's being requested
4	is the penthouse relief. And it's definitely
5	the problem with the architecture of the
6	building. So I think we need work on that
7	before we can approve it.
8	And then finally on
9	sustainability, I think my fellow
LO	Commissioners have addressed that, so I won't
11	belabor the point. So I'm done. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Any
L3	other follow-up questions? Commissioner May?
L 4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I just
L 5	wanted to comment. While sitting at the dais,
L 6	we received this package of 74 letters in
L7	support from students, which is very
L 8	impressive, not just because we got letters
L 9	from students, but we got 74 different letters
20	from students.
21	(LAUGHTER.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER MAY:

22

Because very

	Often we get packages like this that are just
2	form letters handed out to the community.
3	Of course, it begs the question.
4	I assume that there was a class assignment
5	somewhere. And I'm wondering if we're going
6	to hear from that crowd who was in that class
7	tonight.
8	MS. O'NEIL: Believe it or not, it
9	was not a class assignment. The University
10	has been very lucky to have a number of
11	students who have taken a great interest in
12	our campus planning efforts. I think many of
13	the Commissioners saw those students at our
14	Foggy Bottom campus plan hearings all of
15	them, in fact. And they have been engaged in
16	our conversations about the campus.
17	But yes, a few of them are here
18	tonight and would like to address the
19	Commission in a panel form.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: That's great.
21	I look forward to that. And I really do
22	especially appreciate it, particularly if it

was	not	а	class	assignment.
		-	0 = 0. 0 0	0.00 = 9,11110110

And I would also just say that
what's come across in these letters is really
a wide range of interests and reasons for
supporting the plan. And it doesn't even seem
like somebody handed out the bullet points, or
even they read from your talking points or
anything like that. It's a whole range of
things. It's the dance studio. It's the
sledding. It's the jogging through the campus
and dodging cars on Foxhall. So you need the
sidewalk there. All of those things, and like
I said, it's impressive. And the letters that
I obviously couldn't read them very
thoroughly because I'm multi-tasking. But
there all pretty well written too. So that's
impressive as well.

I read a lot of letters. And I also correct my own kid's work. And so this is very well written. I'm very impressed.

MS. O'NEIL: Our colleagues in the University writing program will be very happy

1	to hear you say that.
2	(LAUGHTER.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually,
4	Commissioner May, I'm glad you brought it up.
5	But I was looking through these letters also.
6	But I took another step further.
7	And this may be a cheap shot. But then again,
8	my time is short.
9	But I wonder if GW was in March
10	madness with the sweet sixteen. I wonder if
11	they would have all been here tonight.
12	(LAUGHTER.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That was cheap.
14	That was cheap.
15	Okay. Any other questions,
16	colleagues?
17	(No audible response.)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me call
19	Ms. Heuer up. You have any cross-examination,
20	Ms. Heuer? I got you. I got you. You're
21	covered.
22	Ms. Heuer, do you have any cross-

1	examination? Come forward. Let's try to make
2	a place for Ms. Heuer.
3	Ms. Heuer. Yes, yes. He can come
4	back to the mic. They were trying to give you
5	a closer seat, Ms. Heuer.
6	So maybe the questions might be
7	even nicer. You looked out for her.
8	(LAUGHTER.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So if you
10	could have a seat and introduce yourself.
11	MS. HEUER: I'm Ann Heuer, and I'm
12	representing ANC 3-D tonight. And my single-
13	member district is actually 3-D-06 of which
14	this campus is part of.
15	Yes. I'm going to address the
16	first question to Matt.
17	Can you give me I think you
18	gave it to me but can you give me again the
19	elevation of A1 and A2 relative to the
20	residential properties?
21	MR. BELL: Sure. Let's go to the
22	

1	MS. HEUER: What's the height?
2	What is the height of I mean, I know A1 is
3	39 feet. So what is the height of the
4	buildings across from them?
5	MR. BELL: Okay. Is this on? Can
6	you hear me?
7	Okay. Here's A2 here. A2 here,
8	39 feet. This means the top most portion of
9	the roof including penthouse would be to 267
10	from this mark here.
11	MS. HEUER: I understand what that
12	is. I'm asking what
13	MR. BELL: I'm trying to answer
14	your question.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's what we're
16	going to do. You're going to ask the
17	question, and we're going to let him answer.
18	And then if he doesn't answer to your
19	satisfaction, we'll follow with another
20	question.
21	MR. BELL: Okay. Then across the
22	street, we have the listing of the tallest

1	points of the roofs of these houses here,
2	starting here 246, 244, 246, 254, 267, 271,
3	278, 291, 301, 311, and Meriwether next to it,
4	275. So this eight feet shorter than the
5	building next to it.
6	On Al here, we're showing that
7	roof, the tallest point being 320. And again,
8	these are the heights of the buildings across
9	the street. So this exhibit shows that.
10	Okay?
11	MS. HEUER: Now, let's see.
12	David, you talked about the sidewalk. But do
13	you expect the students to then turn around
14	and walk in the street the rest of the way
15	down to MacArthur Boulevard?
16	MR. AVITABILE: I believe there's
17	a crosswalk right at the western edge of the
18	campus that crosses over from Mount Vernon
19	over to St. Pat's. And from there, they can
20	cross over the street. And I think there's a
21	sidewalk on the other side of the street.

Though I honestly don't know.

22

And I don't

1	know that there's anyone here that can
2	affirmatively testify to exactly far the
3	sidewalk goes down.
4	I do know that DDOT's concern and
5	my conversations with Jeff Jennings was that
6	we at least provide the continuous sidewalk on
7	the north side of Whitehaven to connect with
8	St. Pat's segment so that eventually as the
9	rest of that area is revitalized or developed
LO	or whatever happens with it, they can start to
L1	get a continuous sidewalk on the north side.
12	They just wanted to make sure that we provided
L3	the segment on our side to make that happen.
L4	MS. HEUER: So there'll be a
L 5	crosswalk between the two on the street?
L 6	MR. AVITABILE: Right now my
L7	understanding there's an existing sidewalk
L 8	now. Yes.
L 9	MS. HEUER: All right.
20	MR. AVITABILE: Crosswalk.
21	MS. HEUER: I'll address Kyle
22	Oliver.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

21

22

Have you done any specific planning on these green roofs? I mean, what's going to be on these green roofs? And what are they going to look like in the winter too? So what are the materials that are going to be there?

MR. OLIVER: We have not looked at the green roofs yet on each building because we have no designed the buildings yet.

But typically on a green roof, it can vary. You can go from sedums which is a small -- very small growing plant to -- which is a very short plant, if you will -- to grasses, to even large trees, meaning one- or two-inch diameter trees.

So the green roofs can vary in type of material on top of them. It usually takes a year or two for the plants to get hold to grow properly. So they would need to be watered and maintained to get to their growth.

But before you think about the green roof design, you really have to know

1	what the building is what type of
1	what the building is what type of
2	construction you have for the building.
3	MS. HEUER: Don't you know that at
4	Ames now?
5	MR. OLIVER: I'm going to let Carl
6	answer that because he's the architect and I'm
7	not the engineer on that particular project.
8	MR. ELEFONTE: The short answer
9	right now is that we're not very far developed
LO	in the green roof plan per se. We're still in
11	the preliminary design stage of the project.
12	And that in general there are two
13	types of green roofs. Actually, there are
L 4	five types, but two most readily used types of
L 5	green roofs. There's what's called an
L 6	intensive which is deep planting which is like
L7	gardens on the roof. And then there are
L 8	extensive which are shallower plantings that
L 9	are basically there for storm water management
20	purposes.
21	We anticipate the latter type
22	an extensive roof for storm water management

1	purposes. The green roof will not be located
2	at an occupied roof area. It will be there
3	for storm water only.
4	MS. HEUER: Well, then will you
5	return to the Zoning Commission with these
6	further processing on this building?
7	MR. AVITABILE: This application
8	tonight is the further processing for Ames.
9	It's both the campus plan and for the
10	processing of the Ames as well.
11	MS. HEUER: Even that block up
12	there?
13	MR. AVITABILE: Yes. That's part
14	of why we're talking about that specific
15	design tonight is because we're asking for
16	approval of that building.
17	MS. HEUER: In going back to that
18	processing, you have given fairly complete
19	plans of Ames. But there are a number of
20	other buildings that you're proposing to
21	build. But all we have really is the basic
22	we have a footprint and we have the height of

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
12	
L3	
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L7	

19

20

21

22

the building. But we don't have anything else. Will you be coming back to the Zoning Commission for anything when you come forth with the next building?

MR. AVITABILE: Under the current campus plan regulations, yes, we would come back with each building for further processing approval once we're ready to go forward with the construction.

MS. HEUER: All right. Now Alicia, talking about our population count, if you look at that -- this thing here. If you look at this graph you might say, if you look at it, you can see that the population -- the maximum daily student count -- has slowly decreased.

In the fall of 2005, it was 1419 students. And yet now you're making the statement that you've addressed the impacts of the students. What students? They haven't been there. And the fall of 2005, there were 1419. Now they're only 1,148.

1	Now I realize that you will be
2	going up. But you'll still be even with
3	the 287 students, you will still be below that
4	cap of the 1500. And we are giving you or
5	offering you a ten percent which should be
6	totally adequate to keep the increase a
7	sufficient increase.
8	So I'm asking you how do you say
9	that you've addressed the impacts of those
10	students because you haven't. They haven't
11	been there. We've only 1,148 students.
12	MR. AVITABILE: Well, I think
13	MS. HEUER: And the Ames Building
14	itself with the further classrooms, that won't
15	be finished for another three years.
16	MR. AVITABILE: Well, I think the
17	first piece of the response would be that the
18	Zoning Commission the BZA determined ten
19	years ago that the 1500 students could be
20	accommodated on this campus without
21	objectionable impacts. And over the course of

this campus plan, 1500 students

were

accommodated without objectionable impacts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The second piece of the response would be that this Zoning Commission determined two years ago when they approved Pelham and its 287 new residents that those additional residents would not impose objectionable impacts.

So I think it's already been well established that this campus under the current conditions can handle 1500 students on a daily basis without any trouble. So really the well, focus needs be what about to impact of that additional incremental 15 percent.

And I think given all of the additional additional commitments, all of the additional features of this campus plan that GW is committed to do, and committed to do on a fairly immediate schedule -- closing W Street right away right after Ames is completed, the other landscape and perimeter improvements. You look at that compared to that increase and

I think you can still conclude fairly readily that that 15 percent won't impose objectionable impacts.

MS. HEUER: Well, I'd like to say that. But since we really haven't felt the impact of the increase of coming on Pelham, it's very hard for the neighborhood to say that it won't have an impact. And we're just asking to ease in a little bit slower.

MR. AVITABILE: One other I'd like to point out just so that everyone else does understand why there's the drop off in those numbers, it's in no small part due to the fact that there was an existing Pelham Building that was taken offline right around the time those numbers start to decrease. that's SO partly why those numbers do decrease. Just so everyone understands, this wasn't simply the campus just lost people. was because we took a building offline to add it back on.

MS. HEUER: And David, the Pelham

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	before only had 80 students. That's quite a
2	bit of different. So I don't know where you
3	get the figures the 419 and say you took
4	Pelham away. Well, you only took 80 students
5	away there.
6	MR. AVITABILE: I said that's part
7	of the reason why.
8	MS. HEUER: In reality, there
9	weren't enough classrooms. Some of those
10	people were going to
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Typically, cross-
12	examination is when you just ask a question.
13	MS. HEUER: I asked it and I can't
14	say that it's really been answered. But
15	that's all right.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Are you
17	finished or you have some more?
18	MS. HEUER: No, I'm finished.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I'm
20	not cutting you off. I just wanted you to
21	know you have to ask it in a question. Okay.
22	All right That's it Ms Hener?

1	MS. HEUER: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's all you
3	have? Okay.
4	Let me ask Mr. Pashaian if you
5	have any questions. Do you have a few
6	questions? Come on up.
7	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you. Could
8	we please see I think it's was your page eight
9	where there was a statement that there was
LO	some statement I think that said that the
11	building was toward the center of the campus.
12	It might have been page nine.
13	"Development located to the center
L 4	of the campus away from residential
15	neighborhoods." I just don't quite understand
16	that statement when we have Building A2 which
L7	is right across the street, and we have
18	Building Al which is right on Foxhall. I find
L9	it just I'd like to hear your explanation
20	why you think that's central.
21	MR. BELL: If we could go to the
22	campus plan go to the 2000 plan, please

1 The 2000 plan foresaw square feet worth of development concentrated 2 3 in this area at this edge of the campus. Go ahead further. 4 The 5 plan foresees new 6 development happening here with R-1 and A3 7 towards the center of the campus and a smaller 8 amount of development at the edge with the residential neighborhood. 9 10 Could you go to the next slide? look here, A1 is now a 11 you 12 35,000 square feet as compared to 80,000 in 13 the 2000 plan. There and A2 is 20,000 square feet for a total of 55,000 in that area as 14 compared to 80,000 in the previous plan. 15 16 And then the concentration here of A3, R-1 and A4 here. So the numbers speak to 17 shifting it way towards the center of the 18 19 campus. 20 MR. PASHAIAN: But there shift towards the center, but there is still

some on the periphery.

21

22

80,000

this

1	I would hope the University would
2	provide in these drawings they have here an
3	overlay of the existing buildings with the
4	profiles that they've offered here of the new
5	buildings so that we can have a direct
6	comparison both of height and bulk.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that a cross-
8	examination question?
9	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. My question
10	is would you provide that kind of diagram,
11	please, at least to our group?
12	MS. O'NEIL: I would have to note
13	in response to that question that the
14	University has spent the last year having
15	dialogue of this type with the remainder of
16	the neighbors around our Mount Vernon campus.
17	I would view this request at this
18	hour as a bit tardy. And this being an issue
19	that the University certainly would have been
20	happy to discuss with you for the past 12
21	months.
22	MR. PASHAIAN: Well, as I

1	mentioned earlier, it was our impression that
2	the Alliance was conducting these discussions.
3	And that wasn't the case.
4	So I look forward to discussing
5	with you. But I think some of the questions
6	the Commissioners asked reflected the
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sir, is this a
8	cross-examination question? Because the
9	Commissioners, we've asked ours. So you need
10	to ask a question.
11	MR. PASHAIAN: Okay. Again, I
12	would request that you supply that. It
13	shouldn't be that great a burden, if you would
14	please do that. Would you?
15	MS. O'NEIL: We will submit
16	documentation that the Commission requests
17	from the University.
18	MR. PASHAIAN: Okay. And the only
19	other it's not a question but I would
20	suggest that for the party status that we call
21	it the Foxhall and W Street Coalition.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very

1	much. Foxhall and W Street Coalition.
2	MR. PASHAIAN: I'll look forward
3	to having some engaging discussions with the
4	University personnel.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's make sure we
6	got the name right so my colleagues will
7	remember.
8	Foxhall and W Street
9	MR. PASHAIAN: And W Street
10	Coalition. FAWS F-A-W-S.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: F-A-W-S. Okay,
12	thank you, FAWS.
13	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you very
14	much.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I appreciate that.
16	Okay. Any other questions or
17	comments? Any other questions or comments?
18	He's going to be representing FAWS.
19	Any other questions or comments,
20	Commissioners?
21	(No audible response.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to

the Office of Planning's report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission. I'm Paul Goldstein. I'm with the Office of Planning.

The Office of Planning recommends approval of a special exception under Section 210 for the proposed campus plan for the Mount Vernon campus, further processing for the Ames Hall addition, and related relief subject to several conditions that we've provided in our report.

plan, The proposed as you've heard, would govern the growth and associated impacts on the campus for the next ten years. And as you've also heard, the University has engaged in a lengthy collaborative process involving neighbors, the ANC and District agencies that produced the plan that seeks to balance the University's desire to grow while minimizing impacts on the neighborhood. I'd

NEAL R. GROSS

like to compliment them on what has been a well-managed and professional process that has produced a very good plan.

Some of the salient features of the proposal which are reference with greater specificity in the OP report include the University proposes six development sites and will add approximately a net of 151,000 square feet to the campus. As a result, the campus density would total a little less than 500,000 square feet, or .51 FAR -- floor area ratio -minor which is only a increase over expiring campus plan.

The cap on the number of students on the campus would increase by a measured of percent for full-time amount ten equivalents -- FTEs -- and 15 percent for the student headcount. As a result, the FTE cap would be 1100 and the headcount cap, as you've 1725. number of Mount Vernon heard, The residents who are living on the campus would be limited to 800.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In order to minimize impacts on the neighbors, the University has made many commitments related to campus features such as landscaping, lighting, noise, streetscape, vehicular access, building heights, massing, design and storm water management, and an implementation schedule for several of the commitments has also been provided.

OP supports the special exception I mentioned subject to the adoption of several conditions. We appreciate that the largely University able was to agreement with our proposed conditions that were listed in the OP report. There are just some minor differences between some of language that the University has offered and proposed Office the language by the The proposed OP language attempts Planning. to create a clearer commitment by removing qualifying or predicatory language, and is, in our opinion, a bit more enforceable which has been a Commission preference in the past.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we are at this point quibbling over small things.

Additionally, OP would suggest another change to the University's newest list of conditions related to green building. you've heard, ΟP is supported of the University's commitment to provide a minimum of LEED certification and even exceeding it. noticed in their revised list, they mentioned that it's going to be linked to the Version 3.0 of the LEED certification. We would just ask that the University whatever is the latest LEED rating system at the time of seeking a permit.

OP also finds that the Ames Hall further processing request and the related satisfies roof criteria structure relief applicable special exception criteria. general, the building would expand by 29,000 net new approximately square feet, accommodate a mix of academic/administrative and the relief related to Ames uses,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	would not have an adverse impact on
2	neighboring properties or the zone plan.
3	Finally, OP notes that it has
4	received comments from several other agencies
5	including WASA, D.D. Fire and EMS, and the
6	D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, and DDOT,
7	which are all reflected in the record. ANC 3-
8	D, of course, has also submitted a letter to
9	the record indicating a vote of support of
10	course with their conditions that they've
11	raised tonight.
12	OP appreciates the hard work and
13	collaborative spirit of the University
14	neighbors and the community in producing the
15	plan presented tonight.
16	That concludes my presentation.
17	I'm now available for any questions. Thank
18	you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
20	much, Mr. Goldstein, for a very thorough
21	report. And also I want to commend you on

getting all the comments from the different

1	agencies. We haven't often seen that. I
2	think you and Mr. Jessick are becoming the
3	gurus for getting those comments from those
4	agencies.
5	So let me open it up.
6	Commissioners, any questions of the Office of
7	Planning? Commissioner Schlater?
8	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.
9	Goldstein, you mentioned some differences in
10	the language on the order. Are there any
11	differences you'd like to highlight for the
12	Commission so that we can be aware of them?
13	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure, I can.
14	Like I said at this point, we are
15	
15	when you're quibbling over this type of
16	language, it's pretty small.
17	Under special events, a number of
18	the conditions say things like shall use best
19	efforts that type of language we are just
20	trying to remove. We just want conditions
21	that are enforceable. And those were some.
22	In the implementation schedule,

there was the language for the design of the penthouses began mechanical that where possible. And I can appreciate that. the condition just begins to be wishful and I strongly know the University would hoping. like to fulfill those commitments, but it becomes to enforce that type of language. COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Ιf

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: If possible, I don't know if you highlighted it in your supplemental report already, but maybe you could submit to the Commission highlighting those differences where you'd like to see work done on their language in the order.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: One question raised by your comments, the LEED certification, I think they're committing to an equivalent of LEED certification meaning they would naturally have to achieve LEED certification. I was reading it. It said the GW equivalent of LEED NC 3.0. What does the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CTAT	equivalent	m m ?
(-, // //	201111/41211	

MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's actually a good question. I saw that tonight. I wasn't quite sure what the GW equivalent was. But I understood the spirit of what they were getting at. You can certainly ask them if you'd like on a follow-up question perhaps what was intended or perhaps there's maybe a way that we can just clarify that language a bit more.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Finally, I actually haven't reviewed the WASA report yet.

But one of the objectives in the storm water section is for zero run off into the system.

I just wanted to check. Does that far exceed DDOE and WASA requirements?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm not familiar enough to know the answer to that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: No. WASA's starting point is always that they don't anymore water in the system at all. And then you negotiate from there. So I don't think

NEAL R. GROSS

1	they're exceeding it. I mean, I think this is
2	fairly typical. That's my opinion of it. But
3	I guess I shouldn't be offering testimony.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: And then
5	finally, I just want to get OP's perspective
6	on two things.
7	The headcount increase? You've
8	heard what the ANC had to say. What's OP's
9	perspective on that?
10	MR. GOLDSTEIN: OP's perspective
11	is that the application was able to
12	demonstrate that there wouldn't be an impact.
13	I understand Ms. Heuer's comment. In some
14	sense you are projecting the future, and you
15	make the best accommodations that you can.
16	But based on their traffic study,
17	based on their noise conditions, based on the
18	landscaping along the perimeter, and the fact
19	that this a pretty limited growth to the cap
20	that they currently have, OP didn't see any
20	ends energodizenery nave, or arange see any

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER:

22

Thank you.

1	And then finally the Al building up there,
2	have you studied that particular portion of
3	the site, and do you have any particular
4	concerns with the height and the location of
5	that building?
6	MR. GOLDSTEIN: I do not have any
7	concerns about the height. It's a three-story
8	building. It is buffered by according to
9	the diagrams that are presented tonight a
10	little under 200 feet from the nearest home.
11	It didn't present to us as something that
12	would be in any way substantially
13	objectionable. It seemed like a pretty
14	reasonable request to us.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Thank you,
16	Mr. Goldstein.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
18	questions of the Office of Planning?
19	Mr. Goldstein has already
20	mentioned other government agencies who have
21	submitted comments. If you have any
22	questions maybe we can go to Commissioner

1	May. Can you respond on any of the government
2	questions that we may have? Okay. All right.
3	I just wanted to make sure.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I miss Mr.
5	Jennings not being here.
6	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Do you
7	want me to answer for DDOT?
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I know
10	what the standard reply is.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I notice
12	he has another smart bike rack that he'd like
13	to see.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Yes. With
16	the full smart bike station and
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I didn't
18	hear the Vern offering that as an option.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Smart bike? Yes.
20	Okay. Let's move along with our
21	agenda. Again, as stated, we already have
22	other submissions from other government

1	agencies.
2	Let's go to the report of the
3	Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3-D. Ms.
4	Heuer, if you can up with your presentation.
5	Oh, you know what? I didn't do
6	cross-examination. But let me see if we can
7	go through this.
8	Does the Applicant have any cross-
9	examination?
10	MR. AVITABILE: No.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Heuer,
12	do you have any cross-examination of the
13	Office of Planning?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And FAWS,
16	do you have any cross-examination? No. No
17	cross-examination.
18	Okay, Ms. Heuer, you can come
19	right on up and we'll take your presentation
20	at this time on behalf of the ANC.
21	You can begin, Ms. Heuer.
22	MS. HEUER: Thank you. Good

evening, Chairman Hood and Members of the Zoning Commission.

I am Ann Heuer representing ANC 3-D. I am the Commissioner for the single-member district that includes the GW Mount Vernon campus.

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3-D held its regularly scheduled monthly meeting on Wednesday, March 3, 2010, at Sibly Hospital's Ernst Auditorium. Proper notice of this meeting was given in the Northwest Current, the Palisades List Serve, and through the ANC 3-D website.

A quorum five was present at all times. And at the meeting, the ANC 3-D voted unanimously, five to zero, to approve the GW campus plan with certain conditions. GW has agreed to all of ANC's conditions except one -- the student population cap -- and has included the agreed conditions in its final plan proposal that it submitted to the Zoning Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

The single condition on which GW and ANC 3-D disagree is the student cap. GW is proposing that it be allowed to increase the daily student cap on the Mount Vernon campus by 15 percent and to increase the FTE by ten.

ANC 3-D's condition of approval of the campus plan has the following limitations on the cap. There shall be an increase in the daily student cap of ten percent and in the FTE count of five percent. These increases would be the same as the daily headcount of 1650 and a daily FTE count of 1,050 students. At the end of the five years from the date of the Zoning Commission order, the University can return to the community, ANC 3-D and the Zoning Commission to seek an increase in the student caps by an additional five percent.

ANC 3-D feels strongly that the lower caps on which it has conditioned its approval are reasonable for several reasons. Until now, the GW Mount Vernon campus has

NEAL R. GROSS

housed less than 500 students -- 406 to be exact. In the fall of December 2009, the student headcount was 1148, and the FTE was 623, which is considerable lower than the proposed cap. The proposed cap, which would be a 51 percent increase and a 77 percent increase respectively, this fall 2010, that number will jump to 700 students living on campus with the completion of Pelham Hall, which was approved under the prior campus plan.

In addition, the proposed renovation to Ames Hall, which is planned under the proposed plan to take place in the near term would add another 1,000 classroom seats on the campus. In other words, a dramatic increase in activity on this campus is expected to occur in the next 18 months.

Now up until now, we have not been affected by the number of students. We have good relations with the University, and we want to keep it that way. We want to keep an

NEAL R. GROSS

academic village atmosphere, and not turn the campus into an urban community.

As the Zoning Commission knows, the Mount Vernon campus is located in the middle of a residential area that is zoned R-1A and R-1B. We feel that limiting the student caps to what the ANC has conditioned its approval upon will allow the neighborhood time to assess the impact of this increased activity on a gradual basis.

This request is to similar to the condition that the Zoning Commission made in the 2000 plan. allowed campus Ιt the University to return in five years and ask for an increase, but they declined to do so. believe our condition also allows the University to return to the community and to petition for the balance of the increase that they are requesting is fair and reasonable to both sides.

The other conditions to which we understand GW agrees are the following. The W

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Street entrance will be closed to vehicle
traffic except in emergency situations and on
move-in and move-out days. The W Street
parking lot will be eliminated, and this area
will be improved and enhanced through new
landscaping. A ten-foot wall will be built on
the north side of the athletic field to
further reduce noise impacts. Also no
lighting will be added to the field and no
amplified sound will be permitted after 7:00
p.m. except in the event of a tie game or for
12 special events a year. The 2010 campus
plan shall be approved under current zoning
regulations that address colleges and
universities Title 11, Section 210. And
any further processing of the campus plan
shall be subject to Section 210 to the extent
possible and shall meet with the approval of
the ANC and the community before proceeding to
the Zoning Commission. GW will continue to
run its shuttle bus program but will not
increase the size of the buses used beyond the

size currently used -- 26 seats determined by seat count. GW shall install timers on the tennis court lights within one year of the date GW files its proposed campus plan with the Zoning Commission. GW will respect and implement and any and all agreements made with neighborhood regardless of whether they fall within the scope of the 2010 plan.

We commend GW for developing a campus plan in full cooperation with their campus neighbors but should be compatible with the R-1A and R-1B districts which abut the campus plan. There have been a series of planned meetings with the neighborhood, and it appears that every effort has been made by GW to accommodate the needs of such groups.

Nonetheless, ANC 3-D urges the Zoning Commission to implement the George Washington Mount Vernon 2010 campus plan with all of the conditions that ANC 3-D has attached to its approval, especially the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	reduced student cap to be fair to the
2	surrounding neighborhood. ANC 3-D requests
3	that the Zoning Commission give its conditions
4	the great weight to which it is entitled.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
6	much, Commissioner Heuer.
7	It appears that the only issue
8	from your testimony and it's actually very
9	well done is the issue about the cap.
10	MS. HEUER: That's correct.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's the only
12	issue.
13	MS. HEUER: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
15	Very important. But that's the only issue.
16	MS. HEUER: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's
18	open it up.
19	Colleagues, do you have any
20	questions of Commissioner Heuer?
21	(No audible response.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm not seeing any

1	questions.
2	Do we have any cross-examination?
3	MR. AVITABILE: No.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. FAWS, do
5	you have any cross-examination?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
8	Thank you very much, Ms. Heuer.
9	Now we're going to go to
10	organizations and persons in support.
11	I'm going to call Ms. Gates up by
12	herself Neighbors United Trust.
13	And I understand that the students
14	at GW wanted to come up in panels of three, I
15	believe? Well, we have six. So I'll call
16	them all up at the same time.
17	But let me have Ms. Gates come up
18	by herself first.
19	Good evening, Ms. Gates. You will
20	have five minutes. And when you're ready, you
21	may begin.
22	MS. GATES: Before I begin, may I

just address something that Mr. Turnbull brought up about the two campuses.

Last night I was at the PUD session. And someone from the Foggy Bottom campus came up and said -- asked me about this campus plan and I was very positive. And I think what it boiled down to was campus envy.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. GATES: Good evening,
Chairman. May name is Alma Gates. I'm here
in support of a process, a process that over
the past ten years has changed the George
Washington University Mount Vernon campus from
an adversary to a neighbor.

The 2000 campus planning process and willingness of the University to listen, change and implement to meet neighborhood concerns is the reason a new campus plan is before you tonight with little opposition. The success of this planning process is an anomaly, and credit mainly to the efforts of three individuals.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Associate Vice President and Dear
2	of Freshman Fred Siegel has spent the past
3	seven years changing the face of Mount Vernon
4	in the Berkeley community. As an immediate
5	campus neighbor, Fred is keenly aware of town
6	issues and has worked tirelessly to open up
7	University facilities to the neighborhood.
8	Quarterly meetings, a condition of the 2000
9	campus plan, are opportunities for both the
10	University and the neighborhood to exchange
11	suggestions for improvement. This is the
12	intent of the condition, and here you have an
13	example of quarterly meetings that are well
14	attended, with positive outcomes.

Matt Bell, project architect and facilitator, deserves tremendous credit for his ability to listen, visualize, implement and deliver on changes suggested by the community.

Alicia O'Neil has taken neighborhood-suggested changes back to the University for inclusion in the plan that will

NEAL R. GROSS

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1

2

3

meet the needs of the University for the next ten years and keep new construction in the architecture context of campus and neighborhood scale.

The GW Mount Vernon 2010 campus plan is unique because only a modest increase in square feet is requested beyond what was approved under the 2000 campus plan. FAR of 0.513 will maintain the low-density development sought by neighbors.

skip I'm going to ahead now because much of what I have to say you've already heard. And I'm sorry, I realize I didn't pass in my outline.

I'm going to skip ahead to Number of Students under Section 210.

As a former ANC Commissioner for six of the past ten years and quarterly meeting attendee, I cannot recall one complaint involving a GW Mount Vernon student. The requested increase in students seems a bit ambitious given the University has not

reached its 2000 cap. However, the phasing suggested by ANC 3-D may ease the potential for too many students to overwhelm the neighborhood.

Over the course of several special exception approvals, the University agreed to a series of landscaping plans that have not taken root. The 2010 plan proposes a more aggressive approach to greening and treeing the campus edges. Views from Foxhall Road, W and Whitehaven Parkway will be greatly enhanced.

Storm water management has been a consistent concern of neighbors living below the campus on W Street. The University continues to address the flow of water from the campus, and is committed to implementation of a comprehensive storm water management plan over the life of the 2000 plan, and to manage all natural watershed and site-generated runoff on the Mount Vernon campus.

As I noted in the opening sense of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	my testimony, I am here in support of a
2	process. I strongly support the current
3	zoning process that shaped GW's 2010 campus
4	plan and believe its success will raise the
5	bar for campus plans that come before the
6	Zoning Commission in the future.
7	The Applicant has met its burden
8	of proof and provided a framework against
9	which impacts, size and scale will be judged
10	going forward. The process followed for this
11	plan underlines that keeping a continuing
12	process and the new zoning regulations will
13	help, not hinder, good will, and that ongoing
14	discussions will generate and ensure community
15	connectivity throughout the life of the campus
16	plan.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
19	much, Ms. Gates.

any questions of Ms. Gates? Any have

questions? 22

20

21

NEAL R. GROSS

Let me ask my colleagues. Do you

1	(No audible response.)
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does the
3	Applicant have any cross-examination?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: FAWS, any cross-
6	examination?
7	Oh, I'm sorry. The ANC?
8	(No audible response.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
LO	much, Ms. Gates.
11	Okay. Next we have a panel with
12	the GW Mount Vernon Campus Life.
L3	Nicole Sweeney, Aly Azhar
L 4	hopefully I'm not butchering your names but
L 5	oh, I skipped Rachel. Rachel, if you could
L 6	just come forward and help me pronounce that.
L7	I'm going to try it, but I'm probably going
L 8	to mess it up. Gutauskas.
L 9	It's close? I'm always close.
20	I'm never in the park. Okay.
21	But we're going to start with you,
22	Rachel, if you could help us pronounce your

last name.

MS. GUTAUSKAS: Sure. My last name is Gutauskas.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Gutauskas.

MS. GUTAUSKAS: As he -- well, my last name -- my name is Rachel Gutauskas, and I'm a sophomore at GW. And I'm majoring in political science and concentrating in public policy. And this year, I'm the current Mount Vernon programming council coordinator.

And as a former resident of the Mount Vernon campus and also as a graduate of the Elizabeth Summers Women's Leadership Program, it's my pleasure to be here today and be here with my fellow students and support the 2010 Mount Vernon campus plan.

I actually recently was fortunate enough to have a meeting with George Washington University's President Steven Knapp. And in that meeting, he and I spoke about our excitement that such a large number of students have already expressed interest in

living in Pelham Hall for the next academic year. And it's my firm belief that in order to support the number of students interested in the new residence hall, and also to just encourage more students to live there in future years that the campus will need to expand both its residential and campus life resources.

of the things One that's especially appealing to me is the creation of more classrooms and the academic support space that will be featured in the new Ames Hall. In addition, and I know Aly is going to touch on this a little bit, but another thing that is especially appealing to me is that the University is ensuring that while the campus is expanding, it's also taking into account growing student support behind the friendly buildings and sustainable practices.

And as an advocate for the Mount Vernon campus since I came to the George Washington University in 2008, it is my hope

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that expanding the amenities on this campus
2	specifically in the new Ames Hall, it will
3	attract more excited residents and will
4	provide these residents with equal
5	opportunities to what they would experience if
6	they lived on Foggy Bottom. And hopefully
7	we'll have some more campus envy in the
8	future.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Aly, if you can go
10	next. Mr. Azhar?
11	MR. AZHAR: Hello. My name is Aly
12	Azhar, and I'm currently a freshman majoring
13	in international affairs at the George
14	Washington University.
15	I currently live on the Mount
16	Vernon campus, and I will actually be living
17	in Pelham Hall next year as a house staff
18	member.
19	I'm in full favor of the Mount
20	Vernon campus plan because of its emphasis on
21	environmental sustainability. With the
22	addition of the green pavers on the W Street

1	entrance, which were shown to you previously
2	in the slide show, and its commitment to
3	designing green buildings and the storm water
4	management system which was also heavily
5	discuss across the campus, the Mount Vernon
6	campus plan will continue GW's mission of
7	going green.
8	Many, including myself, are
9	attracted to the Mount Vernon campus because
10	of its green nature. And I am excited that
11	these elements of the campus plan will
12	continue to preserve a feature of the campus
13	that all GW students love.
14	On behalf of my fellow residents
15	on the Mount Vernon campus, I encourage you to
16	pass this plan. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. And I
18	apologize. I went out of order actually. But
19	that's good.
20	Ms. Sweeney Nicole Sweeney?
21	I'm sorry.
22	MS. SWEENEY: My name is Nicole

NEAL R. GROSS

Sweeney, and I am a senior majoring in sociology and a four-year member of the Mount Vernon programming council.

As another former resident of the Mount Vernon campus, one of the things that I've always felt that is extra special about the Mount Vernon campus and the neighboring community is its picturesque nature. the current campus does great job of а blending in with its surroundings, proposed campus plan further incorporates the campus into the neighborhood.

The new entrances both at W Street and Whitehaven will be more consistent with the character of the surrounding community than the existing entrances. Replacing the W Street lot with a walkway and additional greenery will improve the esthetics for both the campus and our neighbors. This will effectively redirect traffic to the primary entrance at Whitehaven Street which will also be improved upon considerably with cleaner and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	more welcoming signage. Additionally, the
2	whole perimeter of the campus will not only
3	retain the existing trees but also under the
4	new plan will be enhanced by additional
5	landscaping. The beautification elements of
6	the proposed plan will ultimately be
7	beneficial to both the GW community and our
8	neighbors here in northwest D.C.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
LO	all very much. We appreciate your testimony.
11	You all did a great a fantastic super
12	fantastic job.
L3	Hold your seat. We may have some
L 4	questions for you.
L 5	Any of my colleagues have any
L 6	questions for this panel? This is the GW
L7	Mount Vernon Campus Life panel. Any question?
L 8	(No audible response.)
L 9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does the Applicant
20	have any cross-examination?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do you
22	have shirts that say The Vern on it or

1	something?
2	MS. SWEENEY: We have Mount Vernon
3	Programming Council shirts.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does the ANC have
5	any cross-examination?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not seeing Ms.
8	Heuer.
9	Okay. FAWS, no cross-examination?
10	(No audible response.)
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
12	three very much. Appreciate that.
13	Okay. The next panel I have
14	signed up are Jason Cherchia hopefully I
15	pronounced that right Dylan Pyne is that
16	who? Dylan? Okay. Dylan. Dylan I think
17	it's Pyne, right? And Brad Monroe.
18	And you all can correct your names
19	if I messed it up.
20	Okay. We'll going to start with
21	Mr. Cherchia. Jason? Did I get that right?
22	Thank you, Jason. You've made me feel real

1	good when I go home.
2	(LAUGHTER.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Make
4	sure your mic is on.
5	MR. CHERCHIA: Good evening, Mr.
6	Commissioner and the other Commissioners.
7	My name is Jason Cherchia and I am
8	currently a junior at the George Washington
9	University and majoring in political science.
10	I regularly travel to the Mount
11	Vernon campus to take classes and participate
12	in other events. And I know I can speak for
13	all GW students when I say that a very
14	important component of the 2010 Mount Vernon
15	campus plan is the proposed pedestrian
16	sidewalks.
17	Currently the students are forced
18	to walk in the street at a variety of
19	locations on the campus which is you can
20	imagine a safety hazard, especially when you
21	consider the fact that the Vern Express, which
22	is the shuttle that runs between the Foggy

1	Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses, also uses
2	the pavement and the streets that run through
3	the campus. So students often find themselves
4	in the path of the shuttle and don't have a
5	place to walk and have to dodge onto the
6	grass. The completion of the pedestrian
7	pathways across the Mount Vernon campus will
8	allow the campus to become a much safer place
9	for the students and other pedestrians.
10	Thank you for your consideration.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
12	Next? Mr. Pyne? Is it Pyne?

MR. PYNE: Pyne.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Pyne. Okay.

MR. PYNE: Howdy. My name is Dylan F. Pyne. I'm a sophomore at the George Washington University double majoring political science and American studies, and a former resident of the Mount Vernon campus during the summer of 2007 as a participant in the Summer Scholars Program.

The first time I took the Vern

NEAL R. GROSS

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Express to the Mount Vernon campus, I couldn't
2	help but feel that I was driving up a back
3	entrance or a loading dock. The proposed Ames
4	renovation gives a welcoming entrance to greet
5	all students when they enter the Mount Vernon
6	campus. The new additions to the building
7	will provide the campus with additional
8	academic space, a new home for the University
9	Police Department staff on campus, and a
10	scenic viewpoint of the softball field.
11	I pledge my full support for the
12	proposed 2010 Mount Vernon campus plan, and I
13	hope you do the same.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
15	much.
16	Mr. Monroe?
17	MR. MONROE: Good evening. I'm
18	Brad Monroe, a sophomore in the School of
19	Business at GW majoring in marketing.
20	The academic offerings that the
21	
I	Mount Vernon campus provides to each and every

they're an unparalleled experience.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

GW attracts students who seek the exciting city life of Washington, D.C., but the availability and offerings of classes taught in the serene and quaint environment of the Mount Vernon campus are a wonderful complement to the GW experience.

additional With the academic provided 2010 spaces by the Mount Vernon campus plan, I foresee many students being able to take advantage of the Mount Vernon thus gaining a more worthwhile wholesome experience while attending GW living in D.C. As a GW tour quide, I have able to see increased interest academic offerings in the future of GW's Mount Vernon campus. This experience will not only be enhanced by GW's new provost, Dr. Steven Lerman, moving to the Mount Vernon campus.

I pledge my full support this evening for the proposed 2010 Mount Vernon campus plan.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, I want to
2	thank this panel. You all as the first panel
3	did a super fantastic job. And you all call
4	yourselves Campaign GW? Okay. Good.
5	Political science folks? I know you were.
6	MR. CHERCHIA: Well, I am
7	personally. But we have a wide range of
8	majors in our group.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well,
10	Campaign GW. All right.
11	Any questions, Commissioners?
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No questions.
14	Do we have any cross-examination
15	the Applicant?
16	(No audible response.)
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The ANC and FAWS?
18	(No audible response.)
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
20	all very much.
21	Do we have anyone else who'd like
22	to testify in support?

1	(No audible response.)
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Then next we will
3	go to the
4	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr.
5	Chairman. I'll be brief as my alma mater is
6	playing in the Sweet Sixteen for the first
7	time ever tonight.
8	(LAUGHTER.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Who was your alma
10	mater? I may be able to tell you something.
11	MR. ROBERTS: Cornell University.
12	We've got some big issues against Kentucky.
13	My name is Dave Roberts. I live
14	on Berkeley Terrace. My house directly abuts
15	the Mount Vernon campus on the west side.
16	Myself and my neighbors are among the most
17	directly affected neighbors when it comes to
18	any of the changes at GW.
19	As I've said before this
20	Commission before, it's my wish that I would
21	not have to get together with you very often.
22	With that said, it's nice to be here tonight.

(LAUGHTER.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. ROBERTS: To be clear -- to be very clear about this, it would be my wish that there would be no additional development on the GW campus. That would be absolutely fine with me.

However, I recognize -- and I believe most of my neighbors would agree that the Mount Vernon campus is a dynamic, educational environment, and it's a place that should be able to have measured growth so long as the growth respects the character of the surrounding neighborhood and the neighbors have the opportunity to provide meaningful input on the process.

Having been in attendance in virtually every one of the Mount Vernon campus meetings, it's belief my that George Washington set out to undertake and indeed was successful in running a process that inclusive, exhaustive and very flexible. it relates to soliciting feedback from

community, they were extremely responsive. Further, it's my opinion that the University for the most part was highly responsive to neighborhood concerns and was willing to make concessions where the community expressed logical opposition.

Alicia O'Neil and her team, as Alma Gates said, should be applauded for their inclusive approach. And of at least equal important, Fred Siegel, GW's Dean of Freshmen and the leader of the Mount Vernon campus and his team should be complimented on the overall handling of campus community relations. Fred has been and continues to be a tremendous asset for the George Washington University.

While I don't agree with each and every aspect of this plan, and I sincerely hope that my neighbors on W Street and Congressman Pashaian a happy resolution to his issues, in its totality, I really believe that this plan is a solid plan. And I'm here today to support it.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Thank you all for your time today,
2	and I appreciate your consideration.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
4	very much.
5	Do we have any cross-examination?
6	Applicant?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The ANC?
9	(No audible response.)
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And FAWS?
11	(No audible response.)
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not seeing
13	anything, thank you very much for your
14	comments.
15	My colleagues, did you have any
16	questions? Comments?
17	(No audible response.)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
19	Okay. Not seeing anyone else who
20	would like to testify in support, we're going
21	
	to go to the party in opposition FAWS

1	MR. PASHAIAN: I'll make my
2	comments very brief. It's the hour is
3	growing late.
4	Yes, we need to go on record at
5	this point of being in opposition, especially
6	to Building 1A which we feel is too large, too
7	cumbersome, and too high for its location on
8	the high ground. Overlooking a new
9	development residential development
10	right across the street
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Excuse me, Chairman
12	Hood, we need to swear him in. I understand
13	he missed the swearing in.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sure he
15	wouldn't tell us anything that's but we
16	have to go through this.
17	MR. PASHAIAN: I'll be more than
18	happy to be sworn in.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good.
20	Because we know you're not going to come here
21	and tell us anything that's not true.
22	So if you stand and raise your

1	right hand.
2	(Whereupon, the witness was
3	sworn.)
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
5	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you for
6	reminding us of that very important point.
7	So that is our position at this
8	point.
9	I would like to comment that the
LO	arrangement that was made between the Berkeley
11	Terrace people and the University caused a bit
12	of consternation all along W Street, and was
13	very, very controversial both in its substance
L 4	and how there was how the two parties
L 5	proceeded. A lot of people on W Street felt
L 6	it was done without their participation and
L7	done behind their backs. But that's history
L 8	now.
L 9	Everybody involved in this knows
20	each other. We're all friends. As I say,
21	unfortunately, the Alliance did not represent

our point of view.

	But I look forward to having
2	useful discussions with the University. And
3	after hearing some of the comments made
4	tonight, I have some confidence that perhaps
5	we can work something out.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That sounds real
7	good. We're looking forward to it. I'm sure
8	the Commission will be looking forward to
9	bridging that gap even closer as you come
LO	back, and especially as they deliberate.
ll	MR. PASHAIAN: I would ask the
12	Commission one request, however, please to
L3	request of the University.
L4	Just a simple overlay of the
15	existing buildings and A1, compared to the
16	profiles of the new buildings so we can see
L7	side-by just one on top of the other so
L8	we can compare direct what the difference in
19	the mass the bulk they call it and the
20	height.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
22	MR PASHATAN. I think that would

1	be simple for them to produce.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm not sure if we
3	already have it. If we don't, I'm sure they
4	will provide that. I thinks that a request
5	okay.
6	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I have a
8	quick question.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have some
10	questions for you.
11	Commissioner Schlater?
12	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.
12 13	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I
13	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I
13	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're
13 14 15	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're here on behalf of Sheila Griffin.
13 14 15 16	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're here on behalf of Sheila Griffin. MR. PASHAIAN: Sheila Griffin
13 14 15 16	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're here on behalf of Sheila Griffin. MR. PASHAIAN: Sheila Griffin happens to be my wife. So I also live at 2200
13 14 15 16 17	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're here on behalf of Sheila Griffin. MR. PASHAIAN: Sheila Griffin happens to be my wife. So I also live at 2200 Foxhall. But she owns the majority interest
13 14 15 16 17 18	Pashaian, do you live in the neighborhood? I just wanted to make that clear because you're here on behalf of Sheila Griffin. MR. PASHAIAN: Sheila Griffin happens to be my wife. So I also live at 2200 Foxhall. But she owns the majority interest in the house. So that's why I presented it

1	house, we probably would have granted the
2	party status.
3	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Thank you
5	very much.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
7	questions?
8	(No audible response.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does the
10	Applicant have any questions? Then we'll get
11	you, Commissioner Heuer.
12	(No audible response.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
14	Avitabile?
15	MR. AVITABILE: Thank you.
16	First question, I just want to get
17	an understanding.
18	Aside from your wife and yourself
19	who are the property owners in the Foxhall
20	and W Street Coalition?
21	MR. PASHAIAN: I don't know fully
22	yet, but I'll let you know when I have the

1	entire list. I was talking to a gentleman
2	just this evening who has the house right next
3	door. He has been out of the country so he
4	told me this evening, and has not been
5	involved in the process, and mentioned that he
6	was not in discussions with the Alliance.
7	So I will do my best to assemble
8	whomever I'm going to assemble and let you
9	know at the earliest possible time.
LO	MR. AVITABILE: Okay. Second
11	question. The University held eight meetings
12	over the course of 2009 between April and
13	November. How many of those community
L 4	meetings did you attend?
15	MR. PASHAIAN: I don't remember
16	attending any. I was out of town a lot. But
L7	once again, we were relying on the Alliance to
18	represent everybody. That was the
L 9	understanding.
20	There were certain concerns that
21	certain members of the Alliance had along W
22	Street that we endorsed with them. But when

1	balanced off against the size and cope of the
2	building was not necessarily of that great
3	importance to us. But as we enter into
4	discussions, we can ventilate all these
5	matters, I'm sure.
6	MR. AVITABILE: Okay. There were
7	also at least four different ANC meetings on
8	this. And how many of those ANC meetings did
9	you attend?
10	MR. PASHAIAN: I attended at least
11	one at which Alicia had the model. And I
12	asked her if that was a scale model. She said
13	it was. And I made a comment that I thought
14	that Building A1 was too high.
15	I don't remember. I think that
16	was late last year or early this year. I
17	don't recall.
18	MR. AVITABILE: Okay. Two more
19	questions.
20	First, were you aware and I
21	think it was talked about tonight but were
22	you aware that GW reduced the size of the A1

1	building between
2	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. And I
3	appreciate that.
4	MR. AVITABILE: Okay. And in the
5	second question
6	MR. PASHAIAN: But it's the
7	comparison to what's there now that I'm
8	interested in, which is why I asked the
9	Commission for all please to supply a direct
10	visual schematic so we can just take a look.
11	It's easier for a layman such as ourselves not
12	accustomed all these drawings to understand
13	what is there and what you're proposing.
14	MR. AVITABILE: Okay. And just
15	one last question.
16	It is your position that the
17	reduction in GFA now this is from the 2000
18	campus plan the reduction from two
19	buildings with 80,000 square feet of gross
20	floor area and residential use to one building
21	with 35,000 square feet and an academic use,
22	is it your position that that is not a

1	significant improvement over the 2000 campus
2	plan?
3	MR. PASHAIAN: No, that's not my
4	position at all. I think that is an
5	improvement.
6	But once again, I couldn't sit
7	here and tell you how what you have now
8	compares to what exists.
9	MR. AVITABILE: That's all my
10	questions. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
12	much.
13	You can hold your seat. We may
14	have
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
16	Chairman, I'm wondering if we could show the
17	2000 the existing condition map. And I'm
18	just trying to make sure I understand where
19	Mr. Pashaian lives.
20	Are you that corner house
21	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes, that is
22	correct.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, that
2	one. You're on W, right there?
3	MR. PASHAIAN: Yes. That is
4	correct.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	MR. PASHAIAN: And as I see the
7	entrance, although the address happens to be
8	2200 Foxhall, the usage the entrance is on
9	are all those the parking the rooms
10	that we spend some time in all overlook W
11	Street and the campus, and particularly of
12	course, that corner of the campus. I guess
13	that would be the northeast corner of the
14	campus.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Have you
16	talked to your neighbor next door on W?
17	MR. PASHAIAN: I talked to him
18	tonight.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: He doesn't
20	seem to have an issue with it.
21	MR. PASHAIAN: I'm not so sure
22	about that. I'll find out and inform

1	everybody.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
3	Thank you.
4	MR. PASHAIAN: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's see.
6	The Applicant's already done.
7	ANC Commissioner Heuer, do you
8	have any cross-examination?
9	MS. HEUER: Well, I guess I'm
10	going to
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can you come to
12	the microphone?
13	MS. HEUER: The question I
14	think you addressed it but I don't
15	understand from that map if we could go back
16	to it you're saying it was David that
17	you were reducing it from 80,000 to 35,000, is
18	that right?
19	MR. AVITABILE: You can't cross-
20	examine me, right now.
21	MS. HEUER: Oh, sorry.
22	MR. AVITABILE: If the Commission

1	wants me to clarify a statement or a question,
2	I'd be happy to do it.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do you have any
4	cross-examination of
5	MS. HEUER: No.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Could you
7	answer her question so she can get
8	clarification?
9	MR. AVITABILE: Sure. Though I
10	didn't get to hear the full question. It was
11	
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Let's
13	do that. Let's do it this way. I can't get
14	in trouble.
15	Can you come up and give us your
16	question.
17	MS. HEUER: Well, I guess I was
18	confused because you said you were reducing
19	the 80,000 square feet to 35,000 square feet.
20	Is that correct?
21	MR. AVITABILE: Well, it's that
22	the 2000 campus plan showed 80,000 square feet

1	in that corner. And we've proposed now 35,000
2	square feet.
3	MS. HEUER: But the other
4	buildings are still staying there. So how
5	many square feet is it?
6	MR. AVITABILE: I don't know the
7	answer to that. It's in our plan. I think
8	the two buildings that are remaining that
9	would have been demolished are roughly 10,000
LO	square feet each. So it's 55, including the
11	two residences that are
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we get her
L3	some clarification on that?
L 4	MR. AVITABILE: Sure. We will do
15	that.
L6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Is that
L7	okay, Commissioner Heuer?
18	MS. HEUER: Yes.
L 9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
20	Thank you very much.
21	Is there anyone here who would
22	like to testify in opposition?

1		(1)	lo au	dible	respo	nse.)			
2		CI	HAIRM	IAN HOO	DD:	Anyo	ne	else	who
3	would	like	to	come	up	and	te	stify	in
4	opposi	tion?							
5		(1)	No au	dible :	respo	nse.)			

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We'll have closing and any rebuttal.

Mr. Avitabile?

MR. AVITABILE: I think we're all I don't think there's anything we feel a need to rebut.

I think the only final statement I'd like to make that this evening through our testimony we've demonstrated that the proposed campus plan including all of its features, including the enrollment increase to 15 percent of the headcount basis, ten percent on an FTE basis, including the proposed location, size of all buildings, will not generate objectionable impacts to the surrounding residential community due to noise, due to traffic, due to the number of students or any

1	£ +
OTDOT	factor.
OCHET	Taclut.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

think we And Ι make that can statement confidently because we spent the last year talking to and listening to members of the community that participated in process and let us know what they thought. And we did everything we could to accommodate their concerns and make changes. And I think as a result, we really do have a plan that accommodates that.

We have the support of OP. We have the support of DDOT. With a disagreement of about 100 students, we have the support of ANC 3-D. And this is really a consensus plan, and we would ask the Commission to approve it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's try to call up some schedules and then comments, make sure we have everything that has been asked for -- that my colleagues, we will deliberate with.

Commissioner Schlater?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.

1	Chairman, I think the record is pretty full.
2	From my perspective, I'd like to see before we
3	take action on this matter some more fully
4	refined drawings of Ames Hall and the
5	penthouse, try to bring that home basically
6	because I think there have been questions
7	raised by all the Commission Members about
8	that.
9	I will also ask for the comparison
10	of the Al Building to the existing buildings.
11	I think that's a reasonable request. And I
12	personally think that those buildings are in a
13	reasonable scale. But I wouldn't mind seeing
14	that comparison particularly since it's been
15	asked for.
16	And other than that, I think
17	that's all I'm requesting.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
19	Commissioners that want to ask for anything or
20	something we asked for?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
22	Mr. Schlater picked up most of the items.

COMMISSIONER MAY: There was some discussion of seeing a comparison of the conditions as OP had drafted the conditions.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, yes. Right.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would also want to -- and I would throw this up for the consideration of my fellow Commissioners -but this is close to being absolutely SO perfect in terms of the ANC's support. think it is within the discretion of the Applicant to tweak the enrollment caps, and I think that they should take a good, hard look And if they can do and come to some at that. agreement with the ANC, that would be great. If they can't, then I would just like to have a little further sort of direct comparison about how they expect the projection, or how they expect the enrollment to grow, and at it would really conflict with point what's being suggested by the ANC. So either little bit more direct information that

NEAL R. GROSS

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	rebuts the concern of the ANC, or coming to
2	some other agreement with the ANC. They could
3	also submit nothing and we could act. But
4	we're very close. It would nice to try to get
5	it all.
6	And also, I think it would be I
7	know there's going to be some further
8	conversation but Mr. Pashaian and hopefully
9	his concerns will be addressed as well. But
10	there isn't anything more than what we've
11	already asked for I think that would help with
12	that.
13	Thanks.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else,
15	Commissioners?
16	The only other thing, Commissioner
17	May, I think you touched on the parking spaces
18	for Lab School. Did we want some more
19	clarification or did they answer that?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that
21	was resolved.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It was resolved?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. Ms.
3	Schellin, we have all that? Does the
4	Applicant and the ANC, everybody are we all
5	on the same page?
6	Can we call the schedule, Ms.
7	Schellin?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: I think we'll
9	probably shoot for the April 26 meeting for
LO	consideration. So we'll give the Applicant
L1	two weeks to provide their responses which
L2	would be April 8th. And then the parties have
L3	until April 15th to provide their responses to
L 4	what is provided. And then we'll take this up
L 5	at our April 26th meeting.
L 6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that schedule
L7	going to be okay with everybody? Do you need
L 8	more time?
L 9	MS. SCHELLIN: Two weeks is enough
20	time. Is that enough time? Two weeks?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that enough
22	time for everybody?

1	Commissioner Heuer, come back to
2	the table.
3	MS. HEUER: We have our next
4	Commission meeting the first week in April,
5	which is already schedule which I think is the
6	5th or 6th.
7	But what I'm seeing as a problem
8	is if they come back, we won't be able to have
9	a vote if they come back and give us an
10	accommodation.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You mean if they
12	come back and give you an accommodation on the
13	cap?
14	MS. HEUER: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Your ANC meeting
16	then is when?
17	MS. HEUER: It's
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: April the 5th or
19	6th?
20	MS. HEUER: Fifth or 6th. It's
21	the first Wednesday.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Seventh.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Seventh.
2	MS. HEUER: Seventh.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And what was the
4	schedule, Ms. Schellin?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: That the Applicant
6	will provide their information on the 8th.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I hate to ask
8	volunteers because I'm a president of a civic
9	organization. I know all your heads went
10	down. So maybe I won't ask the question. i
11	was going to ask about a special
12	MS. HEUER: I know.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman,
14	it seems to me that there's enough time
15	between now and the ANC's meeting to be able
16	to try to come up to some sort of agreement.
17	And if it's going to happen, you can take it
18	to the Commission on the 7th.
19	MS. HEUER: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: And then we can
21	
	get the results on the 8th.

1	what we get on the 8th.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
3	May.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it
5	actually meshes quite well.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, Mr.
7	May helps. Ms. Schellin, are we okay?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May took care
10	of that. Thank you very much.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Have we
14	ever done a conditional increase? I'm
15	thinking that if you started off with the
16	ANC's ten and five, and then say in five years
17	it would automatically jump up to the ten and
18	15 pending any comments from the ANC. Is that
19	another option? Or is that it's kind of a
20	negative way of going at it. But
21	MS. HEUER: That's what I
22	requested.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that's
2	something we can look at when we deliberate
3	depending upon
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it's a
6	slightly different version of what you're
7	suggestion. But I frankly would let them try
8	to figure it out.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Think it
10	out. Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And then even if
12	they did or didn't, then we would have to look
13	at if they took this suggestion that you just
14	made and we looked at that in deliberation,
15	then we have to look at OAG and start talking
16	about enforceable issues.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:Yes. Right.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So there's some
19	other caveats that we can look at.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's
21	what I was getting at. I don't know if it's
22	worth looking at it that way.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, that may be
2	some depending upon what happens they're
3	first and maybe something this Commission
4	may want to deliberate.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
7	Anything else?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Just to remind the
9	parties that they need to serve each other and
10	just reminding FAWS since he's new to this
11	forum that he needs to make sure that if he
12	files a response to what the Applicant serves
13	him with, he needs to make sure that he serves
14	the ANC and the Applicant with his responses
15	also, and file with us by 3:00 o'clock p.m.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're all
17	on the same page. Everything is in order.
18	I want to thank everyone for their
19	participation at this hearing tonight. And
20	this hearing is adjourned.
21	(Whereupon, at 9:42 p.m., the
22	hearing was adjourned.)